







# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

VOL. XVII.—OCTOBER, 1892.—No. 68.

---

## THE CATHOLIC IDEA IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

**W**HAT we mean by the "Catholic Idea" we have explained in an article on "The Catholic Idea in Prophecy," in the April number of the REVIEW, and in another on "The Hierarchy in the First Two Centuries" in the number for July. We have proved that the Christianity prefigured and foretold in the Old Testament, and which is Historical Christianity, is a religion representing and embodying the Catholic idea.

Christianity being the true, the revealed, the divine religion, whose origin is coeval with the existence of mankind on the earth from the beginning to the end of time, its ideal form must be in the New Testament, its most precious document, precisely the same as in prophecy and history. It is, however, important and even necessary to give distinct and separate proof that the Catholic idea is in the New Testament. For, there is a numerous Christian sect, professing to have the pure evangelical and apostolic doctrine, immediately from the New Testament, which totally rejects and denies the Catholic Idea as of alien and human origin.

From their own interpretation of the New Testament as their standpoint, they take a view of ecclesiastical history both before and after Christ which harmonizes with their notion of pure and spiritual religion. The hierarchical, ritual and legal elements of pre-Christian religion are cast aside as obsolete, and the predictions of the prophets concerning the Christian Church are allegorized away. The post-apostolic historical Christianity is represented as an alteration and corruption of the genuine ideal presented in the New Testament. They profess to have gone back to this ideal, and to have restored the pure, primitive Christianity of Christ and the Apostles in conformity with it.



Their conception of Christianity is derived from a false mysticism, an exaggerated spiritualism, which is a counterfeit of the true, genuine mystical theology of contemplative saints in the Catholic Church. The famous book "*Theologia Germanica*" was Luther's favorite manual of spiritual doctrine. Its author was a Catholic, and the book may be interpreted in an orthodox sense, although its vagueness and obscurity made it easily susceptible of being turned to the service of heresy.

The false mysticism in question separates the spirit from the body of the Christian religion, abjuring the sacramental, sacerdotal, hierarchical, ritual, and properly ecclesiastical constitution of the Catholic Church as a superadded structure of human origin and invention. Its most perfect expression is exhibited in Puritanism. A collection of professing believers, regarding themselves as the elect of God, meet together in a building which is not a church but a meeting-house, for extemporaneous prayer, singing of hymns, reading the Bible and preaching. They have elders appointed by themselves to preside over the meeting. They have, indeed, quite inconsistently, baptism and the "Lord's Supper," but they deny their true sacramental character. They have neither priest, altar sacrifice, liturgy, nor anything symbolic and beautiful in the way of ceremonial worship. They think that this was the way of the primitive, apostolic Christians. The Bible, especially the New Testament, they declare to be their only rule of faith, and they profess to find therein their own peculiar form of religious doctrine and practice.

In point of fact, this idea of religion is not only without any foundation in the Old Testament, but it is not to be found in the New Testament. Those who make the profession of taking the New Testament as their rule of faith do not really take it as a whole for their guide, but only certain misinterpreted parts of it, overlooking and neglecting the rest.

It is for them like a palimpsest, a codex which has been written over by a new composition of their own invention, which allows only isolated passages to appear under their superscription, spots of the original text, surrounded by foreign and incongruous writing. Or, to adopt another simile, it is the sacred text, accompanied by a paraphrase and commentary, which alters and perverts its true and original sense, in conformity with the new and private opinions of the commentators.

No doubt, the New Testament needs a paraphrase and a commentary to make its meaning completely and clearly intelligible to those who are reading it after such a long lapse of time since the period of the evangelists and Apostles. Those who deny that the idea which is expressed in the historical Catholic Christianity



of the post-apostolic age is found in the New Testament, make use chiefly of negative arguments. They affirm that many things contained in tradition are not contained in Scripture.

The New Testament does not contain a systematic theology, a code of ecclesiastical law, a liturgy or a ritual. It is made up of the life of Christ, a partial history of the acts of the apostles, a few epistles of circumstance mostly addressed to particular churches, and one mysterious prophetic writing. In order to know what was the constitution, doctrine, discipline and worship of the apostolic Church, to know what is pre-supposed in the writings of the New Testament, what is alluded to, hinted at, really meant by obscure, ambiguous and partial statements, a supplement is necessary. We say that Protestants read into these sacred pages their own sense. They rejoin, that we read into them the Catholic sense. This is indeed true, in respect to all those parts which are not in and by themselves explicit and self-interpreting. But, we read into them the sense which we derive from a coeval tradition, the sense of the nearest disciples of the inspired writers, the sense of their earliest and most authentic interpreters, explaining and elucidating apostolic text by apostolic tradition, illustrating the words of the apostles by their acts, impressed upon primitive history and the general Catholic consciousness of the first Christian generations. The exposition which the second, third, and fourth centuries present of the Christianity of the New Testament is a paraphrase, but it is not an alteration. It renders the sense of every part of it full, complete and harmonious, without doing violence to any sound principles and rules of exegesis and criticism.

No Protestant interpretation can do this, whether Calvinistic, rationalistic, semi-catholic, or of any intermediate stripe. Our procedure is legitimate, and it perfectly protects the divine authority of the Written Word of God. Whereas, the abandonment of the Catholic rule can only issue in the abandonment of the Sacred Scriptures as a rule of faith, and the swallowing up of all dogmatic Christianity by the quicksand of skepticism.

It is necessary to guard against the supposition that the entire New Testament is obscure and ambiguous until it is interpreted by tradition. All the principal Catholic dogmas, and the principles of the sacramental and ecclesiastical discipline of the Church are contained in the New Testament in a clear and explicit manner, and can be proved by an exegesis of the text.

They are not there in a systematic order, as in a catechism or text-book. Therefore, the ordinary reader requires the aid of some formal harmony of the gospels and exposition of the epistles in order to get a connected and complete view of their contents. They are also confirmed, more fully explicated, and illustrated by a



comparison with tradition, and by geographical, historical and doctrinal commentaries. It is the implicit teaching, the allusions to matters supposed to be well-known to the readers, the underlying historical and coeval environment of the writers and readers of the sacred books, which are more or less obscure and ambiguous in the references of the text, until the explanation is furnished by tradition. And in particular it is an exact and minute description of the development and formation of the church out of its inchoate and missionary beginnings into a permanent and regular organization, of the transition from apostolic to episcopal authority, which is wanting, and can only be partially supplied by inference and hypothesis.

Where contemporary testimonies are wanting or scanty, as is particularly the case with the period between A. D. 66 and A. D. 120, we are necessarily obliged to look backward and forward of this period, and to infer from what we know of the two extremes what the middle must have been, in order to fit them at each end and join them together in a logical and historical whole. In this way we fill the gap, we bridge over the chasm. We make a judgment of what the historical development during this half-century must have been, in order to carry on the beginnings of the previous half century. And also, we infer what it really was from what grew out of it in the half-century which followed. We thus get a fair moral certainty in regard to the chief and most substantial parts of Christian doctrine and polity, and the main facts of ecclesiastical growth and historical development, during the half-century which has left so little record of its events, and we have to resort to hypothesis only to fill up the minor details of the grand outline.

A Catholic is not, indeed, obliged to grope among early records and piece together scanty bits of history in order to know what the early Church was like. We know the Catholic Church to be of divine origin, indefectible and infallible. We have her testimony to herself. We know that she has been ever the same, from St. Peter to Leo XIII., from the Council of Jerusalem to the Council of the Vatican. Still, it is interesting to us to follow what traces she has left of her earliest history; and it is necessary to do so, for the instruction of those who are seeking the truth, and the refutation of the advocates of error.

What we desire to do is to reproduce a correct view of the earliest ages of Christianity, especially that obscure portion which intervenes between the Apostles and the Apostolic Fathers—between St. Paul and St. Ignatius. This is the lurking-place into which all anti-Catholic writers, whether evangelicals or rationalists, have been gradually and irresistibly driven by the testimony of



history. Here the Lightfoots and the Renans, and the various others who attempt to reconstruct an early Christianity according to their own different fancies, find a convenient ground for their ingenious theories about the rise and progress of Catholicism. Each one invests his historical romance, Anglican, Puritan, Unitarian, or in some other form mythical, in all the colors and shades, ranging from semi-Catholicism to the boldest rationalism—fantastic structures of mist and cloud, which present a deceptive appearance of landscape. It is an important task to dispel these illusions, and to dislodge our adversaries from their ambush.

Leaving aside all half-way theories, which retain some imperfect hierarchical and liturgical concepts, we turn our attention to that idea of primitive Christianity which is common to Puritanism and rationalism, and which gives it the form of New England Congregationalism.

We may assert, confidently, that such a concept of religion was utterly unknown and impossible to the Jews and Pagans who were the first Christian converts. It could not have entered into their minds unless the Apostles had made it an essential part of their doctrinal teaching, and thoroughly swept away all previous habits of mind derived from their old religions. In this case, a reversion to these old habits, especially while the first enthusiasm remained, and during the lifetime of the disciples of the Apostles, would have been impossible. The dominant idea and character of the Christianity of the middle of the first century must have prevailed during its later period, and must have continued during the succeeding age. Wherefore, in attempting to draw a picture of this earliest Christianity we must borrow the lineaments of the later but still very early Christianity of the period of St. Clement, St. Polycarp, St. Ignatius, and St. Irenæus, with what help we can get from the scanty and obscure hints and allusions of the sacred writers.

Here, St. John the Apostle comes to our aid. He is the connecting link between the Apostles and their successors. He survived during the pontificates of St. Linus, St. Anacletus, and St. Clement. He "founded and governed all the churches of Asia," as St. Jerome informs us. He ordained Polycarp, and through him was the instructor of Irenæus. St. John gives Apostolic sanction to the whole doctrinal and hierarchical system of the second century.

In the Apocalypse, the image of the Church on earth is thrown up into the sky, and in this beautiful cloud-picture we see reflected the Church of the Catholic ideal, with its vested priests, its altar, sacrifice, incense, and monarchical episcopate. The seven golden candlesticks with their stars, the altar and the Lamb, the robed



High Priest, the twenty-four Ancients, the Angels swinging censers, and all the beautiful imagery, are not in harmony with the Puritan and Quaker ideal, but are entirely Catholic. The epistles to the angels of the seven churches show most clearly the monarchical episcopate established in Asia Minor by St. Paul and St. John, and are in perfect agreement with the epistles of St. Ignatius, which were probably written about fifteen years later.

Renan and other anti-Catholic writers refer the beginnings of hierarchical organization to the end of the first century, and especially to that part of Asia Minor afterwards included in the exarchate of Ephesus, and to the action of the apostle St. John. Rationalists, with their hypotheses of Petrine, Pauline and Johannian Christianity, will not, indeed, hesitate to affirm that all this was a change, an alteration, a human development from the original religion of Christ. But the real and sincere believers in the inspiration of the New Testament must take it as all in one piece, homogeneous throughout. They must take the doctrines, the Church, the precepts and the ordinances of Christ and the Apostles as all one and all divine, and therefore accept all that was established under the apostolic authority of St. John in Asia Minor as the carrying out of the instructions which the Lord gave to the Apostles by word of mouth or the revelations of the Holy Spirit, and of the regulations agreed upon by the common consent of the apostolic college. In the Church of Ephesus we have a model and example by which to determine the polity and doctrine of all the apostolic churches and of the Catholic Church in general during the latter half of the first century. Without leaving Ephesus or going beyond the New Testament, we can show that it is the Catholic Idea which is there exhibited.

The Church of Ephesus was founded by St. Paul, who came there about A. D. 53, and remained three years. On his journey from Macedonia to Jerusalem, he bade a solemn farewell and gave a parting charge to the Ephesian clergy and about the year 62, while a prisoner at Rome, he wrote his beautiful and wonderful Epistle to the Ephesians. This Epistle is throughout an exposition of the Catholic Idea of the Church, under two figures, as the Spouse of Christ and as the Body of Christ.

"Christ also hath loved the Church, and delivered himself up for it, that He might sanctify it, cleansing it in the laver of water in the word of life. That He Himself might present to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, that it may be holy and without blemish."<sup>1</sup>

"[God] hath put all things under His feet and given Him to be

---

<sup>1</sup> v. 25-7, *Kenrick's Version*.



head over all the Church, which is His body, and the fulness of Him who is all in all.”<sup>1</sup> It is evidently of the visible, organized Church, that St. Paul speaks, for it is only a corporate society which can be called a “body.” And this appears more clearly from other passages. “Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners; but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, the chief corner-stone being Christ Jesus Himself, in whom all the building framed together groweth into a holy temple in the Lord.”<sup>2</sup>

The unity of the Catholic Church, analogous to the unity of God, of Christ, of the Faith, and the character of this One Catholic Church as the medium of grace, justification and sanctification, are set forth by St. Paul precisely in the same manner as they were afterwards declared by St. Cyprian. “Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one spirit, as ye are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism. One God and Father of all.”<sup>3</sup>

“That we may grow in all things in Him, who is the head, Christ; from whom the whole body, fitted together and connected by every joint which supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of each member, maketh the increase of the body to the building of itself in love.”<sup>4</sup>

The hierarchical order in the Church is explicitly and distinctly mentioned as a divine institution. “Ascending on high, He led captivity captive; He gave gifts to men . . . . And He gave some indeed apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and others pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ.”<sup>5</sup>

The whole doctrine of Catholicism is summed up in these passages. The fundamental Catholic Idea of the Christian Church and Religion is contained and expressed in this one image which represents the Church as the Body of Christ. It is the continuation of the Incarnation, it is one grand and universal Sacrament. The Divine Spirit, the Holy Spirit of God and of Jesus Christ, dwells, in and vivifies a great corporate and organic Society, the Catholic Church. This visible organic Church, over which Christ is the head, is the medium through which He imparts His revelation of truth and His sanctifying grace to individuals and exercises His saving influence upon the world. The sacraments are special channels through which special graces are imparted from the great reservoir of the Church. The priesthood is the guardian of these treasures.

<sup>1</sup> i., 22-3.<sup>2</sup> ii., 19-21.<sup>3</sup> iv., 3-6.<sup>4</sup> iv., 15, 16.<sup>5</sup> iv., 8-12.

"Let a man so regard us as ministers of God and stewards of the mysteries of Christ," *i.e.*, the revealed truths, the sacraments, and other Christian ordinances.<sup>1</sup>

The hierarchy in the Church was established in order to secure unity, to keep order and discipline, to hand down the sacerdotal gifts conferred on the Apostles, to provide for valid and lawful administration of sacraments, to preserve and promulgate the faith delivered to the holy Apostles and disciples of Christ. From the history of Ephesus we derive some special and important information concerning the law of the priesthood which the Apostles established when they provided for the change from apostolic to episcopal government throughout the great missionary field of their labors.

At Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome and Alexandria, fixed episcopal Sees were established, and the local clergy of presbyters and deacons were organized under their bishops. This is quite sufficient to prove that Christ and the Apostles framed the ecclesiastical polity on the episcopal model. That this was the one universal, unchangeable order is evident, when the truly sacerdotal character of the apostolic ministry is considered. The sacerdotal character could only be transmitted by ordination at the hands of men specially empowered as were the Apostles. Presbyters did not possess this power, and therefore no church could be complete without a higher ministry, through which it could receive the benefit of apostolic succession.

The apostolic commission was a permanent one. The foundation of the Church was apostolic. An apostolic succession was therefore essential. And, from the beginning, this apostolic succession has been regarded as the inheritance, not of the priesthood at large but of a select number of chief priests, to whom the title of bishop has been assigned as their specific official designation. Whatever may have been the temporary and provisional government of local churches under the general supervision of the Apostles, during the twenty-five years of their missionary labors, it is certain that before the beginning of the last third of the first century they established everywhere the episcopal regimen. St. Jerome, who is often cited, *hors de propos*, as a witness against the *jus divinum* of the episcopate, gives clear testimony on this point.

"The well-being of the Church depends on the dignity of the Chief Priest, and unless there exists a certain unparticipated and exalted power there will be as many schisms as there are priests in the Church."<sup>2</sup>

"If we inquire why in the Church a baptized person does not

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor., iv., 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Adv. Lucif.*



receive the Holy Spirit, except through the hands of a bishop, learn that this observance descends from the same authority which teaches that the Holy Spirit descended upon the Apostles.”<sup>1</sup>

“With us, bishops hold the place of the Apostles.”<sup>2</sup> “All are successors of the Apostles.”<sup>3</sup>

In the narrative of the first missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas, in the Acts, it is recorded that before their return to Antioch “they ordained priests (presbyters) for them in every church.”<sup>3</sup>

St. Jerome asserts that during this period and down to very near the close of the following extensive missions of St. Paul, in the neighborhood of A.D. 60, the churches were left under the charge of these presbyters, the Apostles, of course, as the history relates, exercising a general supervision over them. But, on account of dissensions, especially at Corinth, St. Jerome goes on to say, “that it was decreed in the whole world (implying that this was done by an apostolic council) that one chosen from the presbyters should be placed over the others, to whom the whole care of the Church should belong, and the seeds of schisms be thus taken away.”<sup>4</sup>

St. Paul wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians from Ephesus between the years 56 and 59, in which he rebukes them for their divisions. If the statement of St. Jerome was anything more than a conjecture and had any foundation in fact, it would appear that it was about this time that St. Paul and the other Apostles took special and active measures for giving the Asiatic churches they had gathered a more regular and permanent constitution.

St. Paul's two Epistles to Timothy prove that he appointed and ordained him bishop of that city, as the local and general tradition testifies, and the similar Epistle to Titus equally shows that episcopal supervision over Crete was assigned to him. The Epistles to Timothy and Titus are an apostolic legacy of advice and instruction, not only to these two bishops, but to all others holding the same office, which the original Apostles, as they were about to disappear from the scene of their labors, were handing over to their successors. Regarded in this light, as admonitory encyclicals addressed to bishops who not only governed particular churches but were also pre-eminent among their brethren and the forerunners of canonically instituted metropolitans, these letters are full of interest and significance. Otherwise they are not intelligible, and therefore rationalistic critics have shown a great desire to get rid of them.

The consecration of Timothy to the episcopate of Ephesus was evidently an event of a momentous character, directed by a special divine revelation, like the mission of Paul and Barnabas from An-

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*<sup>2</sup> *Ad. Evang.*<sup>3</sup> xiv., 22.<sup>4</sup> *Comm. Titus.*

tioch. Several other men of apostolic dignity took part with St. Paul in the solemn act. "I admonish thee," he writes to him, "to stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the laying on of my hands."<sup>1</sup> And again: "Neglect not the grace which is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy with imposition of hands of the priesthood (presbytery)."<sup>2</sup>

In another place he writes: "This charge I give to thee, child Timothy, according to the prophecies which went before concerning thee, that in them thou mayest war a good warfare."<sup>3</sup>

It need not surprise us that St. Paul and his assistants in the ordination of Timothy are called a "presbytery," and this is not in the slightest degree a proof that mere presbyters could ever ordain. St. Chrysostom (*in loc.*) says: "He speaks here not of priests, but of bishops, for the priests did not ordain a bishop." The title of presbyter is used by the sacred writers of the New Testament, and by later ecclesiastical writers, as a generic term, including all grades of the ministry above the order of deacons, even popes and apostles. In its specific sense it was the title of priests of the second order. In the same manner, the Latin term, *sacerdos*, and all the modern derivatives of *presbyter*, such as the English word priest, have been habitually and continuously applied to bishops, who are priests *par excellence*.

St. Jerome and St. John Chrysostom say also that the title of bishop is given in the New Testament to presbyters engaged in pastoral duties.

Anti-Catholic writers are continually insisting on the lack of clearly marked distinction between bishops and presbyters in the New Testament as an argument against the divine constitution of the episcopate. The contention is of no force, however, against the positive and conclusive evidence that the Apostles established the priesthood as a bi-partite order, giving the fulness of the sacerdotal character to their true and proper successors, and a limited participation in the same to priests of the second class, *i.e.*, simple presbyters.

It is certain that from the time when local chief pastors were appointed to rule the churches everywhere, their only proper title was bishop.

It appertained to them exclusively so soon as the ecclesiastical nomenclature became fixed and settled, with the single exception of the later *chor-episcopi*, many of whom were presbyters, having a decanal or quasi-episcopal jurisdiction over country parishes.

Allowing that, in the beginning, those presbyters who shared in the pastoral office may have been included with the bishops under

<sup>1</sup> II. Ep., ii., 1-6.

<sup>2</sup> I. Ep., iv., 14.

<sup>3</sup> I. Ep., I, 18.



the same title taken in its general sense, meaning overseer ; this is a circumstance of no importance. At Athens there was a magistrate called the archon, having assistants called archons. There are four grades of generals and three of admirals in the military service, and in the United States Navy there are four grades of officers, viz., captains, commanders, lieutenant-commanders, and captains of marines, all of whom in common parlance are called captains. If the bishop of a church had presbyters who were his assistants in his sacred office, they might have well been called, in a general way and in a lesser sense, bishops, while the technical designations of ranks in the hierarchy were still in the process of becoming fixed by usage. For instance, in St. Paul's epistle to the Philippians, whose bishop was probably Epiphrodatus, he begins as follows: " Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus, who are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." St. Chrysostom comments upon this passage: " What does this mean? Were there, at that time, many bishops in one city? By no means; but he styled the priests by this name; for, up to that time, they used the name promiscuously, and the bishop was even styled deacon," in the general sense of ministry.<sup>1</sup> Other passages, where bishops and presbyters are mentioned, can be explained in the same way, *i.e.*, that in respect to dignity all who have the priestly character are called presbyters, and in respect to office, all who have some pastoral charge are called bishops. It is not, however, necessary to adopt this explanation; for it is not certain that presbyters were ever called bishops, even in the earliest period of the local clergy. The bishops saluted by St. Paul, in his epistle to the Philippians, may have been bishops of neighboring churches. Many of the epistles have the character of encyclicals, intended not merely for the faithful of particular churches but for a wider circle. If there were bishops in the proper sense, either permanently or temporarily within reach of an epistle sent to Philippi, the salutation of Paul and Timothy was primarily addressed to them, and, inclusively, to all presbyters associated with them in their ministry; or, we may understand by the deacons, in a general sense, all ministers inferior to bishops, including presbyters. A precise adherence to technical and formal style is not to be looked for and is not found in the apostolic writings. Nor was it necessary, where all was understood and familiar to the persons addressed; where the spirit of fraternity, charity, and humility placed all Christians, from the prince of the apostles to the humblest of the brethren, upon one common level in the essential relation toward God as His children, toward Jesus Christ as His brethren.

---

<sup>1</sup> Chrys., *in loc.*

St. Luke relates the history of a most interesting and pathetic scene which was witnessed at Miletus, when St. Paul bade farewell to the clergy of Ephesus and the adjacent region :

"And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the Ancients of the Church." They came, St. Irenæus testifies,<sup>1</sup> and St. Paul implies ("all ye, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God") from the various churches of Asia. Some were undoubtedly bishops, others presbyters, and perhaps the chief men of the laity accompanied their clergy. The charges of St. Paul are primarily addressed to the bishops, although it is all appropriate to presbyters as well, and most of it to all who were present, without exception. He exhorts the bishops particularly, in these words: "Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Spirit has placed you bishops, to rule the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood."<sup>2</sup>

This passage is a most momentous and emphatic expression of the Catholic doctrine that the episcopate, not to the exclusion, but implying the inclusion, of the subordinate priesthood, is of divine institution, and the foundation on which the Church is built; consequently, a continuation of the apostolate. The language of St. Ignatius and St. Cyprian is the echo of the language of St. Paul.

Among all those bishops, Timothy was pre-eminent. He was the Bishop of Ephesus, the capital of Ionia and the chief city of Proconsular Asia. His see was the chief one, and became, by a natural process of ecclesiastical development, not only a metropolis but an exarchate. St. Timothy governed it until nearly the close of the century, and either to him or to his successor was addressed the Epistle to the Angel of the Church of Ephesus, which St. John was inspired to write in the Apocalypse in the name of the Holy Spirit, who had specially designated and placed St. Timothy as the first bishop of that great See.

In St. Paul's Epistles to Timothy are delineated all the powers, the duties, the principles and rules of action, possessed and carried out by one who was a model for all bishops in all succeeding times.

There is the power of ordaining: "The things which thou hast heard of from me through many witnesses the same commit to faithful men who shall be fit to teach others also."<sup>3</sup> The specific directions given by the apostle relate only to bishops and deacons. Priests are passed over, according to the comment of St. Chrysostom, because the qualifications of a presbyter are not different from those of a bishop. In the Epistle to Titus the apostle expressly

<sup>1</sup> Adv. Haer., l. iii., 14.

<sup>2</sup> Acts, xx., 17-38.

<sup>3</sup> II., ii., 2.



says: "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and establish priests (presbyters) in every city." After mentioning certain moral qualities indispensable in a candidate for the priesthood, he proceeds: "For a bishop should be free from censure, as a steward of God."<sup>1</sup> St. John Chrysostom (*in loc.*), considers that the Apostle was directing Titus principally about the ordination of bishops in the cities of Crete. He was acting with apostolic authority and in a missionary capacity, founding churches, and establishing a local clergy, while he probably took charge in person of the Church in the chief city of the island; "exercising a general superintendence such as metropolitans exercise over their suffragans."<sup>2</sup>

The Church in Asia Minor was in a much more advanced and well-ordered condition than it was in Crete. Nevertheless, as the occasion would sometimes arise for filling vacant sees, the pre-eminent rank of the Church of Ephesus and of St. Timothy as its bishop, would naturally give him a great influence in appointing new bishops and the office of consecrating them. Besides, the work of evangelizing those regions and founding new churches was still going on. The instructions of St. Paul in respect to the ordination of bishops are therefore properly to be referred to the case of these chief pastors of churches outside of the city of Ephesus.

Those which relate to presbyters, deacons, and all the different classes of the faithful, are more specially applicable to the government of his own diocese. In general terms he admonishes him to be very careful in his ordinations. "Lay hands quickly on no man, nor be partaker of other men's sins." Speaking of deacons, he directs: "Let these also be first proved (*i.e.*, exercised for a while in lesser offices, and diligently examined—Kenrick), and so let them minister, being charged with no crime. For those who minister well, gain for themselves a good degree (promotion to a higher order—Kenrick)."

"Let priests (presbyters) who rule well be esteemed worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in word and doctrine. Against a presbyter receive not an accusation, unless with two or three witnesses. Those who sin rebuke before all, that the others also may fear."<sup>3</sup>

In his first Epistle St. Paul tells Timothy: "These things I write to thee, hoping to come to thee shortly. But if I tarry long, that thou mayst know how thou oughtest to act in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, pillar and ground of the truth."<sup>4</sup> Evidently, St. Paul has confided to Timothy his

<sup>1</sup> i., 5-7.<sup>2</sup> Kenrick *in loc.*<sup>3</sup> I., iii., iv., v.<sup>4</sup> iii., 15.

own apostolic office, leaving him to replace himself in that supervision and supreme jurisdiction which he had been exercising in person during his missionary career. The presentiment of the approaching end of this career betrays itself. In point of fact, his tarrying had no end, for he never returned, and thus Timothy was left by his master with only the legacy of his example and his instructions to guide him in the exercise of the episcopal office.

In his second Epistle, which may have been the last he ever wrote which has been preserved, this presentiment is more definite. The Apostle, being near his term, breaks out into his triumphant death-song: "For I am now to be sacrificed, and the time of my dissolution is at hand. I have fought the good fight. I have finished the course. I have kept the faith. As to the rest, a crown of justice is laid up for me, which the Lord, the just Judge, will render to me on that day."<sup>1</sup>

With St. Paul, St. Peter and the other surviving Apostles soon finished their earthly career. Jerusalem, particularly its most sacred portion, the Temple, was destroyed, and from A. D. 70 until A. D. 100, St. John alone of the apostolic college was left as the last link of the chain connecting the apostolate with the episcopate, the first with the second century of Christianity. St. John lived mostly at Ephesus, "founded and ruled all the churches of Asia," as St. Jerome affirms, completed the Canon of Scripture, and wrote his sublime Apocalypse, his beautiful and precious Gospel. The place of St. Paul was therefore filled by St. John, and his work continued. He did not, however, supersede the bishops, for he addresses them in the Apocalypse as having all the charges and responsibilities of the pastoral office. The hierarchy was universally and permanently constituted before St. Peter and his colleagues sprinkled the foundations of the Church with their blood.

During the last forty years of the first century the work of evangelization must have been prosecuted with immense enthusiasm, energy and success. This is the period of historic blank, of which anti-Catholic writers complain so much, because it gives them no record of their fancied transformation of Christianity, a process which they have determined must have germinated during this interval. They will never find in this dark cave the seven sleepers who will awake and tell of a primitive Christianity without hierarchy, changing gradually and imperceptibly into a hierarchical Catholicism. It is proved that the hierarchical organization had been constituted when St. Peter and St. Paul suffered

---

<sup>1</sup> iv., 6-8.



martyrdom. St John survived to give his sanction and blessing to all the work of the successors of the Apostles during the last half of the last third of the first century. In the second century we find the Eastern and Western divisions of the Roman Empire and some outlying regions dotted all over with episcopal sees, and these single churches confederated 'in provinces, exarchates and patriarchates, under the Supreme Primacy of the Roman Church, although not under the stately forms and systematic laws which grew up during the two succeeding centuries. What is the reasonable conclusion? That there was a regular, normal progress from St. Peter to St. Victor, St. Mark to St. Dionysius, St. Timothy to Polycrates, St. James the Less to St. Cyril, St. John to St. Irenaeus, in the same lines, from the same principles, and proceeding from a divine origin.

That the Catholic Idea of the Church is the one presented in the New Testament is sufficiently proved by the one foregoing line of argument, showing that the Church is a society organized on the hierarchical principle. It is one great Sacrament, *i.e.*, an outward and visible Body, with an indwelling Spirit, containing and imparting grace, as the instrument of the Author and Giver of grace.

It is proper, however, to proceed still further, by proving that the New Testament teaches the Catholic doctrine respecting the special sacraments of the gospel. That baptism is the sacrament of regeneration is a distinctly Catholic doctrine and pre-supposes the Catholic Idea of the Church. It is true that Luther patched this doctrine together with the real presence, into his crazy-quilt; but it is incompatible with the pseudo-evangelical scheme of Christianity.

Those Protestants who really hold it have taken a long step backward toward Catholicism. The evidence from the New Testament that men are spiritually regenerated in the sacrament of baptism is abundant. The Lord said to Nicodemus: "Unless one be born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."<sup>1</sup>

St. Peter, in his Pentecostal sermon, exhorted his hearers: "Repent, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."<sup>2</sup> Ananias said to Saul of Tarsus: "Rise up, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins."<sup>3</sup>

St. Paul writes to the Colossians: "In whom also ye are circumcised, with a circumcision not made with the hand, in the stripping off of the body of the flesh, but with the circumcision of

---

<sup>1</sup> St. John, iii., 5.<sup>2</sup> Acts, ii., 38.<sup>3</sup> Acts, xxii., 16.

Christ: Buried with him in baptism, in whom also ye are risen again by the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead."<sup>1</sup>

To Titus: "According to His mercy He saved us, by the laver of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, . . . that being justified by His grace, we may be heirs according to hope of eternal life."<sup>2</sup>

The analogy of faith requires that there should be other sacraments signifying and conferring grace. And the other six are mentioned in the New Testament. The Holy Eucharist is not disputed, and Order has been already proved. Confirmation is connected with baptism as one of the first elements of the Christian religion, in the Epistle to the Hebrews. "Wherefore omitting to speak of our commencement in Christ let us proceed to more perfect things, not laying again a foundation of penance from dead works, and of faith towards God, of the doctrine of baptisms (*i.e.*, Jewish ablutions, John's baptism, and Christian baptism as distinguished from these), and of the laying on of hands (when Paul laid his hands on them, the Holy Spirit, he says, came upon them)<sup>3</sup> and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment."<sup>4</sup>

The Sacrament of Penance. "Whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them: and whose sins ye shall retain they are retained."<sup>5</sup>

Extreme Unction. "Is any man sick among you? Let him call in the presbyters of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord."<sup>6</sup>

Matrimony. "This mystery is great, but I say in Christ and in the Church."<sup>7</sup>

The ministers of Christ in the apostolic order and succession are the "stewards of the mysteries," commissioned not by the people but by God; the guardians and administrators of the sacraments and of the grace contained in them. Through communion with them, their lawful pastors, the faithful are united in one Church, in faith, discipline, and the supernatural life of Christ.

This mediatorial office of the ministers of Christ constitutes their generic character of priesthood, and is the foundation of all its specific attributes. In the more strict and proper sense, the specific essence of priesthood is in a divine commission to offer sacrifice.

Among all the seven sacraments the chief and most excellent is the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, which is also the one Sacrifice of the New Law. In this sacrament, Jesus Christ makes His body and blood really and substantially present under the species

<sup>1</sup> II. ii., II, 12.

<sup>2</sup> iii., 5-7.

<sup>3</sup> *St. Chrys. in loc.*

<sup>4</sup> vi., I, 2.

<sup>5</sup> St. John, xx., 23.

<sup>6</sup> Ep. St. James, v., 14.

<sup>7</sup> Eph., v., 32.



of bread and wine, as a sacrifice of adoration, thanksgiving, expiation, and impetration, in which all the merits of the Sacrifice of the Cross are offered up to God and applied to men.

In the communion, it is also the spiritual sustenance of Christians, the source of grace and life, the very bread of angels, and the earnest of immortality. The highest act of the Christian priesthood is therefore the consecration of the Holy Eucharist. No man is capable of performing this act without a special communication of the sacerdotal character of Jesus Christ. And herein lies the special necessity of the Sacrament of Order, and of the positive law of Jesus Christ, confiding the power of ordination to the Apostles and their successors. It is also true of all the other sacraments except baptism and matrimony that their validity depends upon the ordination of the minister. No ordination of priests has ever been recognized as valid in the Church except ordination by a bishop, himself empowered by a special consecration received through an unbroken series of bishops from the Apostles and Jesus Christ. Hence the absolute necessity of the apostolic succession in the episcopate, not merely to the well-being and good order of the Church, but to its very being. The Church subsists chiefly in the priesthood, and the priesthood in the bishops, who have received the plenitude of the priesthood, and who are themselves bound together in one under their supreme head, the Bishop of the Catholic Church.

The priesthood is especially correlated to sacrifice, and the Catholic doctrine of the sacrificial nature of the sacrament of the Blessed Eucharist is principally derived from the dogma of the Real Presence. It is superfluous to cite the passages from the New Testament in which this dogma is declared. There is no dogma of faith more clearly and explicitly revealed than this one, in the Written Word of God. And the numerous works of able and learned authors fully treating of the doctrine are so easily accessible that there is no occasion for giving in this article even the briefest epitome of their arguments.

There are, however, some more general considerations in respect to the Catholic doctrine of priesthood and sacrifice in the New Law of the Christian Church which we will briefly present. The foundation of the whole doctrine lies in the dogma of faith, that Jesus Christ, true God and true man, the Mediator of the New Covenant, is a Priest *forever*, after the order of Melchisedech. For this reason, He must, besides fulfilling all the other functions of a Mediator, continually offer a sacrifice like that of Melchisedech, viz., a *Minchah*, the elements of which are Bread and Wine. To this end, He must have human priests who represent His person on the earth. In the epistle to the Hebrews the faithful are

exhorted to "consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Jesus."<sup>1</sup> Those two titles are connected as correlated terms, expressing the Mission of the Son in His human nature from the Father. St. Peter and his twelve colleagues in the apostleship received a communication of this same mission. Whatever Jesus Christ was by virtue of this mission, they were, in a lesser and subordinate sense, as vicars and representatives of Christ, representing God before the people, and the people before God. That is they were mediators, through whom Christ exercised His mediatorial office. As Mediator He is Prophet, Priest and King; and so they also, must have a delegated prophetic, priestly and ruling office in the Church. Their commission was given to them as perpetual, lasting until the end of the world. And therefore, although certain additional and temporary gifts were granted to the original Apostles and to many other individuals among the primitive clergy and laity, the essential endowments of the priesthood, as well as the essential Christian graces, were made transmissible along the line of apostolic succession. All this is explicitly and abundantly taught, in the New Testament, as Catholic writers, and to a certain extent Protestant writers of the highest reputation, have very fully and unanswerably proved.

There is, therefore, a perpetual priesthood in the Catholic Church, for offering sacrifice, administering sacraments, preaching the word of God, and governing the Christian society.

It is often objected that the terms of sacerdotal and liturgical usage in the Greek language were not adopted by the apostolic writers of the books of the New Testament, to designate offices and ordinances in the Christian Church. Certainly, there is much in the silence, the obscurity, the omissions, and in general the negative characteristics of the New Testament which surprises us; and would not only surprise but bewilder us if we regarded the Bible as the only and the proximate rule of faith. The difference in phraseology between the sacred writings of the New Testament and the writings of St. Cyprian, for instance, is very marked; and we can perceive a gradual change in ecclesiastical style during the two centuries between him and St. Paul.

A prejudice and objection against the Catholic doctrine from this source arises only from a superficial view of the text of the New Testament, and of the earliest Christian writers. It disappears upon a closer examination.

There was a reason why the Lord should cover the mysteries contained in His person and His work with a veil which was only partially and gradually lifted during the earliest period of the

---

<sup>1</sup> iii., 1.



manifestation of the truth and grace of the Gospel to the world. The clear manifestation of the high-priesthood of Jesus Christ, involving the abrogation of the Aaronic priesthood, was not made in the earliest writings of the New Testament. It appears first with great distinctness in the Epistle to the Hebrews, at a time when Judaism was approaching its last agony and the destruction of Jerusalem was near at hand. Even in this epistle, it is the priesthood of Jesus Christ as anointed to fulfil the work of redemption by the bloody sacrifice of the Cross, the one and only oblation of its kind, once offered, which is alone the topic of a clear and full exposition. The topic of the continual, unbloody sacrifice of the New Law, and the priesthood in the Christian Church, is not treated, but is left covered by the veil which shrouded the Christian mysteries from the profane and the uninitiated. That economy and principle of reserve in communicating religious knowledge which the Lord practised during his personal ministry, was continued by the apostles. The discipline of the secret was observed even down to the time of Tertullian, Origen and St. Cyprian. It was specially enforced in respect to the rites and ceremonies of the Holy Eucharist. Besides all the reasons which persuaded the apostles to establish and observe this discipline in general, there were particular motives for hiding their claims to sacerdotal and pontifical prerogatives under modest and unassuming titles. If St. James had openly proclaimed that the Temple with its hierarchy, its sacrifices, its Paschal and Pentecostal feasts had been set aside in favor of a New Law; that the Cœnaculum was the true temple, where the Lamb of God was mystically offered on a Christian altar by Himself as the real High Priest in Jerusalem of a new Covenant, He could not have remained one day in Jerusalem. If St. Peter and the Apostles had assumed high-sounding titles like those of Jewish and Pagan pontiffs, and bidden open defiance to the chiefs of the national religions, the fury of persecution would have been sooner and more violently enkindled, and only an immediate and irresistible exercise of omnipotence could have prevented the strangling of the infant Church in its cradle.

As the hidden significance and power of Christianity by degrees revealed itself, the imperial monster began to fear it, and a Decius could say that he dreaded the succession of a new Bishop of Rome more than the appearance of a rival claimant to the throne. Christianity came upon the arena in due course of events to contend for the dominion of the world. And when, by degrees, its doctrines and institutions became more publicly known, Christian writers naturally fell into the use of those Greek and Latin terms which were consecrated by long custom to express elements common to all religions.

There are not wanting, however, hints, allusions, and occasional expressions in the sacred writings which are like rifts in the veil which the discipline of the secret hung over the sacred mysteries of the Christian religion, its sacerdotal functions and holy rites of worship. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, Jesus Christ is declared to be, not only a Priest, inasmuch as he offered an atoning sacrifice on the cross, but also "a great Priest over the house of God,"<sup>1</sup> i.e. the Church. St. Paul calls Christian believers "a chosen race, a royal priesthood,"<sup>2</sup> and similar language is used in the Apocalypse. The sacerdotal character of Christ's headship over the Church, imparting a share of His fulness of grace to His members, implies a priesthood *par excellence*, in the principal and ruling members of the body of Christ. St. Paul to the Romans speaks of "the grace which is given me of God, that I should be the minister of Christ Jesus among the Gentiles: ministering the gospel of God, that the oblation of the Gentiles may be made acceptable, and sanctified in the Holy Spirit."<sup>3</sup> The significance of this passage is diminished and obscured in the Latin, still more in the English version. The Greek word rendered by "minister" is *λειτουργός*, minister of sacred rites, the word rendered by "sanctificans," and "ministering" is *ιερουργεῖν*, enacting as a priest that which the Gospel contains: and the word translated by "oblatio" is the purely sacrificial term *προσφορά*.

The direct scope and intent of this passage, no doubt, refers to the conversion of the Gentiles, and the fruits of virtue and piety produced among them are described in metaphorical language borrowed from sacrificial rites. Yet the whole phraseology is sacerdotal and allusive to the Christian Sacrifice and sacraments. Catechumens would not understand more than met the ear. But the initiated would understand what was given in baptism, confirmation and the Holy Eucharist. They would think of the continual approach to the altar to assist at the mysteries and receive communion, by which all their prayers and good works were hal-  
lowed and made sacrificial offerings to God through Christ.

When the Hebrew Christians were exhorted: "Having, therefore, brethren, confidence to enter into the sanctuary by the blood of Christ, by the new and living sacrifice way which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is, His own flesh, and having a great priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart in the fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our body washed with clean water,"<sup>4</sup> they understood this in accordance with the teaching they had already received.

<sup>1</sup> x., 21.<sup>2</sup> Eph. I, Ep., ii., 9.<sup>3</sup> xv., 15, 16.<sup>4</sup> x., 19-22.



We know the Roman tradition derived from St. Peter and St. Paul, and by it we can interpret the hidden meaning of St. Paul, which was perfectly intelligible to the faithful of Rome when his Epistle was read to them or perused devoutly in their private copies. We know the tradition of the Church of Jerusalem by the Catechetical Lectures of St. Cyril. And we can surely infer that those who read the Epistle to the Hebrews understood by the washing in pure water the sacrament of baptism, and that the way of drawing near to Christ was by the sacrament of the altar.

They must have understood the altar of the Holy Eucharistic Sacrifice to be meant in the words of their inspired teacher: "We have an altar (*θυσιαστήριον*, *i.e.*, sacrificatorium) whereof they who serve the tabernacle have no right to eat"; and that the exhortation: "Through Him, therefore, let us offer always a sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips celebrating His name," was most perfectly fulfilled by joining in the hymns and prayers of their liturgical worship.<sup>1</sup>

The Liturgy is alluded to in the description of an event which took place at Antioch when Paul and Barnabas were sent forth on their great apostolical mission. The Church of Antioch at this early period presented a most interesting spectacle.

St. Peter had previously taken a special and personal oversight of the blooming and flourishing congregation, in which the glorious name of "Christian" first began to be applied to the disciples of Christ; so that the ancient tradition designated him as its first bishop, and the patriarchal dignity which was acquired by Antioch took its first principal motive from its quality as a See of Peter. At the time described by St. Luke, when he begins his history of the long and extensive missionary career of St. Paul, a considerable group of the higher clergy were gathered together in the principal church of the city. The same historian calls them "prophets and teachers."

They were therefore endowed with the extraordinary charismata which were at that time so frequently and abundantly given to the men who were employed in laying the foundations of Christianity. Among those was the gift of prophecy, supernatural illumination in respect to the doctrines of the faith, in respect to the measures to be undertaken in propagating the faith, and, where necessary, foresight of future events.

They were also specially engaged in preaching the Word, for the instruction of the faithful, of catechumens, and of the hearers from among Jews and heathens, who came to get information about

---

<sup>1</sup> Heb., xiii., 10, 15.

the new religion. It appears that a continual round of exercises of preaching, prayer, religious observances and devotions, accompanied by frequent and strict fasting, was kept up in the church with unusual zeal and fervor.

"Now there were in the church, which was at Antioch, prophets and teachers, among them Barnabas, and Simon who was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manahen, who was the foster-brother of Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. And as they were ministering to the Lord, and fasting, the Holy Spirit said to them: 'Set apart for Me Saul and Barnabas, for the work whereunto I have called them.' And when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away."<sup>1</sup>

Whether this solemn setting apart of Saul and Barnabas was their episcopal consecration, as St. John Chrysostom and many commentators down to Kenrick suppose, or an extraordinary invocation of the Holy Spirit and benediction in His name given by inspiration at the inauguration of the great work of the conversion of the Gentiles, we shall not stop to consider. The special reason we have for citing this passage is found in the phrase "ministering to the Lord."

The Greek word is *λειτουργούντων*, which Erasmus translates *sacrificantibus*. It is literally translated, *performing liturgical acts*. They were ministering to the Lord, and not merely to the people, performing acts of worship for which they prepared themselves by fasting. The acts of this ministration were a liturgy, *i.e.*, according to the only Christian sense from the beginning until now, a solemn celebration of the Holy Eucharist. St. Luke's readers who belonged to the faithful would know by this single word what was done in the church of Antioch, and have a picture before their mind of the sanctuary, the clergy, the rites, and prayers. If we would get their view, we must look back on the scene through the glass of tradition. St. John Chrysostom, in the fifth century, compiled a Liturgy which has been ever since generally used in churches of the Greek Rite. This Liturgy was a recension of the Liturgy of St. Basil of Cæsarea, which was derived from the Liturgy of St. James of Jerusalem. This Liturgy of St. James, also those of St. Peter, St. John and St. Mark, are undoubtedly of apostolic origin, and all agree with each other and with all Catholic liturgies in essentials and in some accidentals, while exhibiting many variations in other minor respects. These liturgies, it is needless to say, explicitly and fully express the doctrines of the real presence and of the sacrificial nature of the Holy Eucharist. From them we know the doctrine and the liturgical practice of the apostolic age.

---

<sup>1</sup> Acts, xiii., 1-3.



If space permitted, a thorough analysis and exposition of the Epistle of Pope Clement, the First to the Corinthians, written about A.D. 97, would give a complete justification of the thesis of this article. He was a disciple of the Apostles, and lived through the pontificates of the two immediate successors of St. Peter, St. Linus and St. Anacletus, the period which may justly be called the historical blank. The effort to extend this period as far as the year 120 is not well sustained. The most probable date of the martyrdom of St. Ignatius and of his Epistles is the year 107 or thereabouts. From St. Clement and St. Ignatius, survivors of the Apostles and contemporaries with St. John, perfectly familiar therefore with the constitution of the Church and hierarchy during the last thirty years of the first century, we have all the testimony we need to connect the teaching and action of St. Paul with those of St. Polycarp, St. Irenæus and Tertullian. It is impossible to insert a wedge anywhere along the line to break the continuity of the apostolic tradition. The statements of St. Irenæus respecting the apostolic origin and authority of the Catholic episcopate of the second century must be taken as absolutely true and irrefragable.

There is one essential element in the Catholic Idea remaining to be spoken of, viz., the infallible authority of the *Ecclesia Docens*. The doctrine that the teaching of the Church is the proximate rule of faith, having for its object the revealed word of God, both written and unwritten, and its sources in Scripture and Apostolic tradition, is so indissolubly interwoven with the fact and dogma of apostolic succession in the Episcopate that it really does not need, though it is abundantly capable of, separate proof from the New Testament.

The Catholic Idea is that the Church is the one institute of salvation. The individual believer receives his life in and through the Church. The radical principle of this life, of justification and sanctification, is faith. Faith must therefore be received from the Holy Spirit through the Church. The faith is one and is the inmost principle,—the vital force of Catholic unity. This unity being primarily instituted in the unity of the hierarchy, the faith of the body of bishops, under their supreme head, that is of the *Ecclesia Docens*; is the rule of the faith of the body of Christian believers.

That the apostles were the *Ecclesia Docens*, that they were infallible in their doctrinal and moral teaching, and that this teaching was the rule of faith to the Church, is unquestionable. This rule must be in some way permanent. The common Protestant doctrine is well known, that, viz., the apostolic teaching was embodied in the books of the New Testament, which, together with the

books contained in the Jewish Canon of Holy Scripture, became the proximate, permanent and only rule of faith for all Christian believers to the end of time. It is one of the surprising phenomena of history that such a doctrine has found a wide acceptance. It is incredible, on the face of it, that the apostles left such a rule of faith to the Church of future ages. But, supposing that this had been their intention and the will of God, it is plain that they must have given a canon of the Scriptures of both Testaments: *i.e.*, St. John must have done so, or at least have added his own writings to the catalogue of canonical books. Besides, considering what the Bible actually is, and how impossible it would be for all the faithful to take their faith at first hand from the whole miscellaneous collection of inspired writings, it would seem that an inspired compendium of its divine doctrines and precepts must have been published, with a strict command that it should be read by all who could read, and taught orally to all others, as a condition of church-fellowship.

In point of fact there is not the slightest indication either in the New Testament or in the early ecclesiastical writers of any change of the rule of faith from a living, teaching authority to a collection of inspired writings. The commission of teaching given to the Apostles, like the commission of government and administration of sacraments, is given without any limitation of time and place, as perpetual and universal. It is, therefore, a commission to themselves and their successors forever.

The First Epistle of St. John, which was probably addressed about the year 92 to the bishops of Asia Minor as an introduction to his gospel, gives the final apostolic declaration concerning the rule of faith.

"We are of God. He who knoweth God heareth us; he who is not of God heareth us not; in this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error."<sup>1</sup> St. John was the only Apostle living at this time. The only authoritative teachers whom he could have meant to associate with himself were the bishops whom he was addressing and other Catholic bishops.

Thirty years before this time, St. Paul addresses St. Timothy, the chief among these same bishops of Asia Minor, as one to whom the apostolic commission of teaching had been imparted. The rule which he is to follow is the apostolic teaching which he received from St. Paul, and which he is to commit to all those whom he ordains to the episcopal office. "O Timothy, keep the deposit. Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me. And the things which thou hast heard from me through many

---

<sup>1</sup> I Ep., iv., 6.



witnesses, the same commit to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also.”<sup>1</sup>

In connection with these and other passages presenting the doctrine of the living teacher as the proximate rule of Catholic faith, and the tradition of the unwritten word as one part of the remote rule, there is a most interesting and important text concerning Holy Scripture as another part of the same rule.

“Continue then in the things which thou hast learned and which are committed to thee, knowing from whom thou hast learned them. And because from infancy thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which can instruct thee to salvation by the faith which is in Christ Jesus. Every Scripture divinely inspired is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in justice.”<sup>2</sup>

This is one of the few passages in the apostolic writings in which the inspiration of Holy Scripture is clearly and explicitly declared. We may infer that St. Paul included New Testament Scriptures with those of the Old Testament as divinely inspired, since St. Peter classes the epistles of St. Paul with the other Scriptures. But for a positive, categorical declaration of this doctrine we depend on tradition and the decision of the Church, as well as for the complete and certain canon of the books of both Testaments. That inspiration ceased, and the divine revelation was finally completed when the last Apostle died, we know only by the teaching of the Church. In this way only we know, therefore, what gifts of the Spirit were personal to the Apostles, and what was the limitation of the apostolic office and commission which they transmitted to their successors. The Apostles alone were founders of the Church, because it could be founded only once. Their institution of sacraments, their constitution of the hierarchy, their promulgation of the faith, their deliverance of revealed and inspired truths orally and in writing, were accomplished once for all as a permanent and unchangeable work. But as they must necessarily have successors in government, administration of sacraments, preaching of the gospel to all mankind, so the duty and the power of preserving, interpreting and teaching the divine dogmas and precepts of the Christian Revelation must have been handed down to these successors. Infallibility is necessarily implied in the existence of this duty and power of the *Ecclesia Docens*, *i.e.*, the Catholic Episcopate.<sup>3</sup>

It is an essential part of the Catholic idea that the supreme apostolate was given to St. Peter and the supreme episcopate to

<sup>1</sup> II., iii., 14-16.

<sup>2</sup> I Ep., vi., 20; II., i.; I3, ii., 2.

<sup>3</sup> See F. Lyons' *Christianity and Infallibility*, ch. iii. New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 15 E. 16th Street.

his successors in the Roman See, which is, in a supereminent sense, the Holy and Apostolic See of the Catholic Church.

The first time that the Catholic Church is spoken of in the Gospel is on the memorable occasion when the Lord exacted from St. Peter at Cæsarea-Philippi the confession of His divinity.

"Simon Peter answered and said: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." And Jesus answered and said to him: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father, who is in heaven. And I say to thee, that thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven."<sup>1</sup> Comment upon this passage is quite unnecessary and seems only to detract from its force. An intelligent child who knows in a general way the history and the claims of the Roman See can perceive that it can possibly have but one meaning. It is quite enough by itself, without citing the other passages of the same import from the New Testament. It sums up the whole Catholic doctrine of the Church.

The Catholic idea in the New Testament has been presented only by marking some salient points and indicating the lines of an argument which is capable of a much fuller and more complete development. Notwithstanding the great ability and excellence, the learning and conclusive reasoning, of many Catholic works proving all the doctrine of the Church from the Scriptures, this rich mine is by no means exhausted. It is possible and most desirable that new and skilful workmen should bring forth the treasures hidden in these divine Scriptures, and by the aid of all the resources of modern scholarship, illustrate in new methods, adapted to modern wants and conditions, the truths of revelation ever ancient and ever new.

The same may be said of early ecclesiastical history. After all the works of research and historical criticism which have thrown light upon this comparatively obscure period, there still remains a great work to be done in this department. I do not say that this work needs to be begun. Already excellent treatises have appeared in Italy, France and Germany, and their number has constantly increased. Some of these have been translated into English. But our English Catholic literature needs to be enriched, and we need especially to have all that the best scholarship can furnish, both from Scripture and ancient authors, bearing on the

---

<sup>1</sup> St. Matt., xvi., 16-19.



exposition of all the principal Catholic doctrines, collected, arranged and put in convenient shape for general use, in a systematic and comprehensive manner.

Thorough work, not only in the earliest, but also in the later ecclesiastical history, has been already commenced at the Catholic University. In the present article, and the one preceding, which contain the substance of lectures given during the University Public Course, we have, of course, not pretended to treat our topics exhaustively. To do so would require one or more volumes. But we are confident that we have sufficiently proved that Scriptural and Historical Christianity are identical with each other, and each is identical with Catholicism. These three terms are indissolubly united. The effort to break the historical continuity of Catholicism by finding a foothold in the earliest period of Christianity for that system of pseudo-spiritualism which, for want of a better name, we will call Evangelicalism, has proved an utter failure. In like manner, the endeavor to establish the same on the foundation of Holy Scripture as a so-called Bible-Christianity, has turned out to be futile.

There cannot be a dogmatic Christianity without a tradition correlated to the Holy Scripture, and a doctrinal authority in the Church. The old Protestant orthodoxy has ceased to put forth the appearance of a systematic theology, presenting a strong front and array for defence or aggression.

It is true, that it still counts able and scholarly men, who produce works which are full of learning, and not wanting in sound reasoning and valuable instruction in relation to many matters of natural and revealed religion. But, to a great extent, the best of these works are written in defence of facts, principles, truths, and ideas, which are substantially Catholic.

When it comes to a systematic and definite exposition and defence of the proper differential Protestant theory of religion, as opposite to the Catholic idea, we find little except silence, evasion, ignoring of Catholic arguments, and a petty criticism which picks flaws in exegesis or evidence, and tries to hide in all the obscure caves it can find. Indeed, by common consent, the day of the old Protestant orthodoxy is over. Its dogmatism is melting away into sentimentalism. Just as the old Eastern empire was invaded and vanquished by the Saracens, its ecclesiastical domain is melting away before the incursion of rationalism. The Bible, which Chillingworth called "The Religion of Protestants," is being torn in pieces by its former worshippers. Devout believers in the divinity of Christ and the inspiration of the Bible have really no refuge to flee into but the old Catholic Church, from which they are estranged through the crime of the original schismatics of the

sixteenth century. For three hundred years they have been feeding on the crumbs falling from the table of the children of the household of God. The successors of these destroyers of faith are striving now to drive them out from even the courtyard of the Church into the streets. They are welcome to the banqueting-hall, and to the well-provided table of the children, where the bread of angels is blessed and distributed by the priests of the Lord.

There is no refuge in rationalism. It is not better, but rather worse, than old Protestantism, because it is more logical and consistent. The better the logic, the worse and falser the conclusions, when the premises are bad and false. It is all destructive, and its final end is destruction. It can originate and construct nothing whatever, much less anything better than old, genuine Christianity. Christianity, without the divinity of Christ, is not worth having. Without Christianity, Theism and Natural Religion cannot stand. Believe in God, and you must believe in Christ; believe in Christ, and you must believe in the Church. Reject the Church, and you must reject the true Christ of the Gospel, God and Man, the Redeemer of the World, the Crucified, Risen Lord of Heaven and Earth. Reject the Son, and you must deny the Father, the Creator, the Giver of Immortality. The quicksands of agnosticism, universal skepticism, pessimism, nihilism, will swallow you up. You can be saved from this dismal catastrophe only by inconsistency. A happy inconsistency, indeed, but still an inconsistency. If you would have a religion which is at once rational, historical, and Scriptural, which is the genuine, authentic religion of Christ, you must embrace the Christianity of the Catholic Church, for there is no other which satisfies the demands of reason and of faith.

AUGUSTINE F. HEWIT.

---



## THE CHURCH AND ENGLISH LIBERTY.

THE erudite Balmes, in his great work on "Civilization," says, that "before Protestantism, European civilization had reached all the development which was possible for it." The gifted Spaniard means, of course, all the development possible under the circumstances; for, so long as human nature continues to be what it is, there will always be room for social improvement.

This much is certain, that long before the appearance of Protestantism, the Church had throttled barbarism and thrown it—had exorcised the spirit of darkness, and enthroned the spirit of light; had caused governments to be established throughout western Europe, in the ages we call dark, that would compare favorably with some of the best of this century of enlightenment; had created representative systems in which the authority of monarchs was limited, and fundamental laws were in full force; had founded schools, universities, and hospitals; in a word, had put forward all the principles of civilization, and embodied the most salutary of them in institutions with wonderful results. When Protestantism came to impede and cripple her, she had placed the liberties of many nations on a secure basis. That she had done so in England, it is the purpose of this article to show.

The mission of the Church, in every country to which her devoted and heroic children have borne her banner, is to proclaim the truth to high and low alike. The ruler and the ruled must learn and practice her doctrines. These doctrines are the same the world over, and while she respects the *bona fide* compacts of men, her teaching, radiant with the spirit caught from the Sermon on the Mount, inculcates more enlightened action. With *de jure*, or even *de facto* governments, whatever there may be in them of an objectionable nature, she does not violently interfere. She satisfies herself with sowing the seed, and awaits, in sighs and tears but with hope, the coming of the harvest. Her mission and method are well expressed by the poet, John Henry Cardinal Newman:

" Bide thou thy time!  
 Watch with meek eyes the race of pride and crime,  
 Sit in the gate, and be the heathen's jest,  
 Smiling and self-possest.  
 O, thou, to whom is pledged a victor's sway,  
 Bide thou the victor's day !

" Think on the sin

That reaped the unripe seed, and toiled to win

Foul history-marks at Bethel and at Dan,

No blessing, but a ban ;

Whilst the wise Shepherd hid his heaven-told fate,

Nor reck'd a tyrant's hate.

" Such loss is gain ;

Wait the bright Advent that shall loose thy chain !

E'en now the shadows break, and gleams divine

Edge the dim distant line

When thrones are trembling and earth's fat ones quail,

True Seed ! thou shalt prevail !"

Such was her course in the days of the Cæsars ; and such has been her course ever since. It has borne abundant fruit in every land, but especially in the land that was destined to play the same part in the modern world as Greece and Rome in the ancient.

The materials which Augustine and his followers found for their work in the land from which Roman civilization had been extirpated were, indeed, disheartening to flesh and blood ; but men with the commission of heaven, the sword of the spirit, and the promises of the law, cared not, recked not. Radiant with hope, buoyed up with love, filled with human and divine knowledge, they entered on their mission with the banner of the Redeemer high in air, and the canticles of Mother Church ascending to heaven. Soon paganism tottered to its fall, the shackles were broken from the limbs of the Briton, attempts were made to restore conformity in the ancient Church, its ministers were reformed, and its children recalled to the land of their nativity and love. Kings and queens received the sceptre of truth, and wielded it with zeal and efficacy. The transformation effected by Augustine and his followers in their day, was truly marvellous considering the forces against which they had to contend—forces against which Pict and Scot and Briton were as chaff before the wind, and Roman and Christian civilization as débris before the hurricane. The oak tree, under whose shadow royalty received the message that Paul had thundered centuries before on Mars Hill, expanded its boughs and branches until all parts of the Saxon Heptarchy found shelter and asylum under it.

This happy consummation was accompanied with many reforms in the government of the country. Though the Roman Empire had yielded to the inroads of Goth and Hun, Visigoth and Ostrogoth—though scourge after scourge had drained its veins and paralyzed its march—though it sat disconsolate, sighing over departed greatness—its laws and literature perpetuated its rule as effectually, in one sense, as its legions had done in the days when they triumphantly bore her eagles through every part of the world. The



weapons were changed, the objects of warfare changed, but the supremacy of the Cæsars was succeeded by the supremacy of the Roman pontiffs. The language and laws of Rome, purified, were borne by saintly men to all quarters of the globe, and the nations that sat in darkness and in the shadow of death, rude and unlettered, received tidings of great joy in a two-fold sense—a redemption in time and in eternity.

Although it was not until the year 1140 that Gratian's splendid work on canon law appeared—although it was not until ninety-four years afterwards that Raimond de Pennafort, commissioned by Gregory IX., published the five books of Decretals—canon law in the days of Augustine was studied as a science, and as a system of jurisprudence compared favorably with the civil code to which it was somewhat indebted.

Now, it was in 596 or 597 that Augustine landed in England, and it was in 529 that Justinian's code appeared. Therefore, the work of Trebonian, the Roman Blackstone, was well known in the early days of Augustine, and must have been freely used by canonists of the period. Previous, however, to the time of Justinian, various collections of the laws had been made, and the Church of those ages, distinguished for the grandest intellects that shone in her history, surrounded by every snare, made herself master of every legitimate art of defence. Situated as she was, she found it necessary to know the law, and that she did know it, whether collected or scattered over almost innumerable volumes, there can be and there is no question.

Lest, however, there may be any doubt on this subject, we will state here that, after the triumph of the Cross of Constantine, the bishops of the Roman Empire were empowered by the civil code to hear and decide cases, even between the laity; and the canon law made it obligatory on the part of the clergy to submit their disputes to their respective diocesans. Moreover, Dr. Lingard tells us, that Ethelbert published a code of laws to regulate the administration of justice, and that for this code he was largely indebted to the suggestions of the missionaries, *who were accustomed to the forms and decisions of Roman jurisprudence*. Therefore canonists and civilians, more or less skilled, Augustine and his followers landed in Britain; and we hazard nothing in saying that their successors, through the centuries until the edifice of English liberty was almost complete, possessed the same knowledge and used it with the same prudence and zeal.

Before proceeding further, it may be well to form some idea of the civil law, and, for this purpose, we cannot do better than quote the words of our own Kent. In the twenty-third lecture of his "Commentaries" he says: "The civil law shows the proof of the

highest cultivation and refinement, and no one who peruses it can well avoid the conviction that it has been the fruitful source of those comprehensive views and solid principles which have been applied to elevate and adorn the jurisprudence of modern nations. . . . The whole body of the civil law will excite never-failing curiosity, and receive the homage of scholars, as a singular monument of wisdom. It fills such a large space in the eye of human reason; it regulates so many interests of man as a social and civilized being; it embodies so much thought, reflection, experience, and labor; it leads us so far into the recesses of antiquity, and it has stood so long against the waves and weathers of time, that it is impossible, while engaged in the contemplation of the system, not to be struck with some portion of the awe and veneration which are felt in the midst of the solitudes of a majestic ruin." According to the profound Balmes, this law was enriched by the writings of the early fathers, and after the conversion of Constantine, when Catholic doctrines were upheld by imperial authority, it received some of its most enduring and salutary principles from the Church.

Of the canon law, in the days of Gregory IX., away back in 1234, the learned, but by no means unprejudiced, Hallam, historian and jurist, says: "In these books (the five books of Decretals) we find a regular and copious system of jurisprudence, derived in a great measure from the civil law, but with considerable deviation, and possibly improvement." ("Middle Ages," vol. ii., page 3.)

With a knowledge of these two systems of jurisprudence, so highly spoken of by such profound scholars and jurists, how great must have been the influence exercised on government and legislation by the missionaries and their successors, especially when we consider the ascendancy which they gained by virtue of their spiritual ministrations and power? Even in the absence of direct testimony, a contrary supposition would be monstrous. It would be equivalent to saying that Christianity was a fraud, or, that its ministers were ignorant or degraded. We know, however, that from the day that the heptarchy surrendered to the spiritual supremacy of Augustine, until the robber banner of the Norman triumphed at Hastings, the Anglo-Saxons, from the throne to the hovel, heeded the teachings of the Church. And, for that age, a most enlightened Church, indeed—the Church of a Bede and Alcuin—a Church whose monasteries and nunneries numbered more kings, princes, nobles, queens, and princesses, than in the same space of time, with the same population, were ever known in any other country. Misfortune did not impel them to enter the cloister, as happened in lands less favored by heaven. The thirty kings and queens who, within two hundred years, laid aside their crowns to serve God in chastity, poverty, and obedience, did so when no

shadow\*rested on their thrones. From these facts it must be apparent that the Church had vast control, and it is safe to assume that her treasures of knowledge were used for the enlightenment and liberty of the people.

Much has been written, much spoken, regarding the customs and laws of the Anglo-Saxons, yet it must be confessed that there is not a great deal of accurate information possessed on the subject, even by the most painstaking antiquaries. "Every account of the civil polity of the Anglo-Saxons," says Dr. Lingard, "must necessarily be imperfect. We can only view the subject through the intervening gloom of eight centuries; and the faint light which is furnished by imperfect notices, scattered hints and partial descriptions, may serve to irritate, but not to satisfy curiosity. It would be in vain to seek for information in the works of foreign writers, and the native historians never imagined that it could be requisite to delineate institutions with which they had been familiarized from their childhood, and which they naturally judged would be perpetuated along with their posterity" ("History of England," vol. i., page 190).

A collection of the laws was said to have been made in the reign of Alfred, known as the *Dom Bok* or "*Liber Judicialis*," and another in the reign of Edward the Confessor, and designated the "*Leges Eduardi*." During the rule of the Normans and the early Plantagenets, the "*Leges Eduardi*" were frequently referred to as containing all that was desirable, and their confirmation constantly demanded. These collections are lost. Doubtless they were destroyed at the time of the Reformation, when nearly all the learning of the Anglo-Saxons was given to the flames; an excellent preparation for the reign of absolutism in religion as in government. Tynell, in his "*History of England*," page 152, says: "From the conversion of the Saxons most of the laws made in the *witenagemote*, or great councils, were carefully preserved, and would have been conveyed to us more entire had it not been for the loss of so many curious monuments of antiquity at the suppression of monasteries, in the reign of King Henry VIII. Florence of Worcester and William of Malmesbury claim that their histories are copied from monastic chronicles, in which much that appertained to the customs, laws, government and history of the Anglo-Saxons was carefully recorded. Valuable indeed as were these chronicles, and lamentable as was their destruction, had they been preserved they would not have done justice to the usages and legislation of the time. Judge Cooley remarks: "In estimating the proportion that Saxon usages contributed to the formation of English law, it would be too limited a view if we should take into account only the records now extant of particular laws and forms of proceeding.



These records are imperfect, and even if we had the entire body of laws so far as they were ever reduced to writing, it would furnish but a part of what then existed and was perpetuated, and again it would be leaving out the self-developing power inherent in the habits of the people" (*"American Cyclopædia,"* vol. i., page 147).

History and tradition combine in ascribing a rare degree of excellence to the customs and laws of that period; and it is the verdict of both that it was then that the foundation of English liberty was laid, and that all that has since been obtained is little more than confirmation or commentary. If, therefore, we would form a just estimate of the liberties enjoyed by Englishmen, we should bend all our mental energies to the study of Catholic England, the England that Augustine and his successors, up to the time when the soul of the good King Edward took its flight to Heaven, had made the brightest gem in the tiara of Peter, and to which they had given a system of jurisprudence that is as admirable, as the Church from which it sprung is imperishable.

Alexis De Tocqueville, in his *"Democracy in America,"* remarks that the entire man is to be seen in the cradle of the child, that we must know the child if we would understand the passions and the virtues that will rule his life, and that there is something analogous to this in the growth of nations. The Saxon child is the Englishman of to day grown to advanced manhood. English society is a growth and development of Anglo-Saxon society, and as such should be regarded, if we would understandingly read it.

As it is not our purpose to follow the order of historical events, or to attempt any learned discussion of the growth of the English Constitution, but to emphasize a few leading facts regarding fundamental rights and to cite authorities bearing on them, we will pass over much that is of interest and that might be relevant.

The power of the Church, after the Anglo-Saxon period, was contested, and, to some extent, controlled, during the long interval between the year 1066 and the reign of Henry VIII., when it was not only disregarded but trampled on. The new dynasty could ill brook the salutary restraints that such prelates as Anselm of Canterbury sought to impose. By injustice it had triumphed, and by injustice it would continue triumphant. In the time of William the Conqueror and his sons, the native Church, as well as the natives, was proscribed, and only foreign ecclesiastics were intrusted with exalted positions. Hallam, the historian of the Middle Ages and of the English Constitution, says that for a hundred years after the conquest, natives were not appointed to offices of trust or emolument in State or Church, and Lord Lyttleton, in his history of Henry II., affirms that Becket was the first Englishman who reached an exalted station.

The foreign ecclesiastics, however, did not always prove as pliable as was expected; and when they began to see that the robbers were not very particular about whose property they appropriated or whose rights they disregarded, when they began to see that they were to be made accomplices in crime, a change took place which antagonized Church and State, hitherto so harmonious. Then commenced a contest, bitter and unrelenting, in which all the forces of barbaric power, all the passions of corrupt nature, were arrayed against religion, virtue, intelligence and law. The patrimony of the Church, when the Anglo-Saxon population had been despoiled, became the object of artifice and even violence. Its revenues were appropriated and squandered in riot and debauchery. Prelates eminent for their learning and sanctity, men whose virtues and attainments would shed lustre on any age, were driven from their sees, and compelled to live on charity in distant lands. They had no alternative between poverty in exile and degradation, and, like Anselm, they chose the former. Who can read, even at this distance, of the indignities heaped upon this great prelate, without a feeling of intense indignation at the barbarity and fiendish passions that held carnival on thrones and in palaces? And later, what more horribly shocking than the inhumanity of Henry II. towards Thomas à Becket, for refusing his consent to Constitutions that would make the Church the slave of the State, that would destroy the independence of the ecclesiastical court, and change it, from being the most enlightened in Europe, to a thing of ridicule and contempt. As we look at the life of this illustrious man, at its persecutions and indignities, we are led, from a natural point of view, to regard his assassination in the light of a deliverance.

Thank God, through all that trying period, there were never wanting Anselms, Theobalds, Becketts, and Langtons in the high places to bless and cheer the people in their efforts to be free, or, as they put it, to win back "the customs and laws of the good king Edward." The struggle was dreary, protracted, and often bloody. Shoulder to shoulder with them, in that struggle, were their own clergy—the clergy who sprang from them, who were bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh, and who were bound to them by every tie, as well as by a common cause. Shoulder to shoulder, triumph came; real triumph, not its semblance, as in the charters of Henry I., Stephen, and Henry II. Shoulder to shoulder, in spite of every power of darkness, England continues to be Saxon, and the *Leges Eduardi* find an equivalent in the *Magna Charta* wrung from the royal ruffian John by "the army of God and of the Holy Church."

A recent writer in the "Harvard Law Review," a review that in the domain of legal science is second to none in this or any other country, remarks: "In one aspect the *Magna Charta* represents

an end and consummation, in another a beginning. It was, for the most part, a compilation of the ancient customs of the realm, or the laws of king Edward the Confessor, as they existed before the Norman conquest. On the other hand, it was the first great declaration of the rights of the new nation, the various elements of which several causes had combined to unite and consolidate, and from this time forth the constant demand of the people is for a confirmation not of the *Leges Eduardi* but of the *Magna Charta*." ("Harvard Law Review," March, 1891, page 370.)

So important was this charter considered by our Catholic ancestors, that, according to Dr. Lingard, the most painstaking and accurate of English historians, it was confirmed thirty-eight times—by Henry III., six times; by Edward I., three times; by Edward III., fifteen times; by Richard II., six times; by Henry IV., six times; by Henry V., once, and by Henry VI., once.

Though the *Magna Charta* swept away many great abuses—though it secured a speedy administration of justice, established the court of common pleas at Westminster, facilitated the trial of issues, made justice easy to all with as little expense as possible in those days, corrected abuses in trials by wager of law and of battle, gave a new impetus to commerce, enjoined uniformity in weights and measures, placed on a secure basis the liberties of all the cities, towns, burghs, and ports, guaranteed the rights of the Church, provided "that every liberty and custom which the king had granted to his tenants, as far as concerned him, should be observed by the clergy and laity towards their tenants, as far as concerned them"—though these and many other rights and privileges were secured, the most material feature is the thirty-ninth article, from which the life, liberty, and property clauses of our American constitution are not only derived but copied.

The rights guaranteed by this article were always recognized by the common law, and classed as absolute, but they were often lost sight of by kings and barons.

As it is the foundation of civil freedom in England, and as it is incorporated in our constitution, we give it in the form in which the dastard tyrant signed it: "*Nullus liber homo capiatur, vel imprisonetur, aut dissaisiatur, aut utlagetur, aut exuletur, aut aliquomodo destruatur, nec super eum ibimus, nec super eum mittemus, nisi per legale iudicium parium suorum, vel per legem terrae.*" (Stubbs' "Select Charters," 301.) "No freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or disseized, or outlawed, or banished, or any ways destroyed; nor will we pass upon him, nor send upon him, unless by the legal judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land."

Blackstone, commenting on this, maintains that the right of life is secured by the words *nullus liber homo aliquo modo destruatur*,



that the right of personal liberty is secured by *capitur vel imprisonetur*, and property by *dissaisiatur de libero tenemento*. The words after *dissaisiatur* are found in the confirmatory statute of 9 Henry III., and are merely explanatory.

Placing ourselves in touch with the age of king John, glancing at the past and looking out into the future, too much cannot be said in praise of the *Magna Charta*. Many have considered that its admirers have overrated it—that it has not exercised the influence on the Anglo-Saxon race which is claimed for it. Hallam, averse as he was to do justice to the Church during the formative period of English liberty and law, does not hesitate to say, that it is still the keystone of British liberty, and that “all that has since been obtained is little more than as confirmation or commentary—that if every subsequent law were to be swept away, there would still remain the bold features that distinguish a free from a despotic monarchy.” (“Middle Ages,” vol. ii., p. 116.)

It was not, as some suppose, obtained by the Church and the barons solely, and for their exclusive benefit. The Langtons and Pembrokes were not alone. Back of them were the people, the new nation, and they were partakers alike of the glory of its achievement and of its benefits. It secured to all freemen their fundamental rights, rights which always existed in theory, and declared that they could not be deprived of them unless by the legal judgment of their peers or by the law of the land.

Moreover the *villeins*, then numerous, and in their then condition exempted from its benefits, were not without hope. The merging of the Norman and Anglo-Saxon, the weakening of the bonds of feudalism, the advance of the new nation, the community of interests, of aspirations, of privileges between the aristocracy and the large and prosperous element known as freemen, were destined to have a salutary bearing on their condition. The promised land from that moment was in view. Freedom was not only possible but probable. It came gradually, and with it all the rights and privileges of the *Magna Charta*.

It is important, especially in the light of subsequent events, to remark that while theoretically the monarchs of England were never absolute, practically all the monarchs from the Conqueror down were little else. The *Magna Charta* sealed the doom of absolutism by establishing the supremacy of the law, and the forces which led to it made perilous its violation. It was these forces that gave it vitality and permanence; that continued its life without gap or interval; that made it a rallying cry in after days, as the “*Leges Eduardi*” had been during the long gloom of Anglo-Saxon bondage; that led to the formation of a House of Commons, which still exists, and that enabled the learned Hallam,

ages later, to say: "I know not whether there are any essential privileges of our countrymen, any fundamental securities against arbitrary power, so far as they depend upon positive institution, which may not be traced to the time when the house of Plantagenet filled the English throne" ("Middle Ages," vol. ii., page 401).

The other great bulwarks of English liberty are the Petition of Rights, the *Habeas Corpus* and the Bill of Rights. These, in their essential features, are contained in Magna Charta. It is not claimed that there is anything in them startlingly new, anything deserving of much note that had not come down from Catholic times, and that was not incorporated with the common law in the days of the Anglo-Saxons and the Plantagenets. The cause for the demand of these securities was that the law as it existed before the Tudors and Stuarts was defied and trampled on, and it was urged that they were merely a re-assertion, in a more specific manner, of rights often, it is true, violated, but always proclaimed and never denied in theory. Now, when these measures were proposed, the very theory was assailed, and the omnipotence of monarchs defended and reduced to practice. All the checks which the wisdom of Catholics had placed on royal authority had been disregarded. The rights of Parliament were treated with contempt; life, liberty and property were subject to the caprices, the passions and the barbarity of a tyranny that deluged England in blood and tears.

The principles prevalent in the time of the Tudors and Stuarts, so far as kingly power was concerned, were founded on no legal precedents, were sanctioned by no legislation, remote or immediate, but were in conflict with the aspirations and usages of the Anglo-Saxon race from the time of the missionary Augustine to the time of the apostate Henry VIII. "The sweeping maxims of absolute power," says Hallam, "which servile judges and churchmen taught the Tudor and Stuart princes, made no progress under the Plantagenet line" ("Middle Ages," vol. ii., page 132).

This opinion of Hallam is sustained by the authority of Sir John Fortescue, Chief Justice of the King's Bench under Henry VI., in a work entitled "*De Laudibus Legum Angliæ*," which was written especially for the instruction of a prince who expected to succeed to the throne. With a few citations from it, bearing on the rights and duties of the king, we close this branch of our subject. In the ninth chapter he discourses as follows: "A king of England cannot at his pleasure make any alterations in the laws of the land, for the nature of his government is not only regal but political. Had it been merely regal, he would have a power to make what innovations and alterations he pleased in the laws of the

kingdom, impose tallages and other hardships upon the people, whether they would or no, without their consent, which sort of government the civil laws point out when they declare *Quod principi placuit, legis habet vigorem*. But it is much otherwise with a king whose government is political, because he can neither make any alteration or change in the laws of the realm without the consent of the subjects, nor burden them against their wills with strange impositions; so that a people governed by such laws as are made with their own consent and approbation, enjoy their properties securely and without the hazard of being deprived of them, by the king or any other. The same thing may be effected under an absolute prince, provided he do not degenerate into the tyrant. Of such a prince Aristotle, in the third of his 'Politics,' says, 'It is better for a city to be governed by a good man than by good laws.' But because it does not always happen that the person presiding over a people is so qualified, St. Thomas, in the book which he wrote to the king of Cyprus, 'De Regimine Principum,' wishes that a kingdom could be so instituted as that the king might not be at liberty to tyrannize over his people, which only comes to pass in the present case; that is, when the sovereign power is restrained by political laws. Rejoice, therefore, my good prince, that such is the law of the kingdom you are to inherit, because it will afford, both to yourself and subjects, the greatest security and satisfaction." In the thirteenth chapter he says: "As the head of a body natural cannot change its nerves and sinews, cannot deny to the several parts their proper energy, their due proportion and aliment of blood; neither can a king, who is the head of a body politic, change the laws thereof, nor take from the people what is theirs by right against their consent. Thus you have, sir, the formal institution of every political kingdom, from which you may guess at the power which a king may exercise with respect to the laws and the subject; for he is appointed to protect his subjects in their lives, properties and laws. For this very end and purpose he has the delegation of power from the people, and he has no just claim to any other power but this." Had this doctrine prevailed in the time of the Tudors and Stuarts, Charles would have retained his head, and countless lives and treasure would have been saved.

From what has been urged, it must be apparent that the English Constitution had reached almost its present perfection while England was Catholic. Now there are, and there always have been, men of various grades of intelligence who attribute this happy consummation to the development of the principles and institutions of the Germanic race, the race that made such short work of Roman civilization before the coming of Augustine. There is no foundation in fact for this assertion. It is not only



unhistorical, but irrational. In the writings of Tacitus, it is true, some things may be found that would give color to it; but when the historian's utterances are rightly understood, the fabric raised on them falls to the ground. When Tacitus wrote, conjugal fidelity in Rome was regarded as idiocy, and married women boasted of their change of husbands and of their general profligacy. Trajan, the best of the Roman emperors, was steeped in debauchery. Lechery rioted and rotted in the high places, and in order to check it the historian presents an ideal picture from the German forests that is historically misleading. From this picture, which his own admissions blur, reverence for the marriage tie and respect for woman, so general throughout Europe in the ages of faith, it is argued, came not from Christianity, but from the forest-home of barbarians.

What ground is there for it? Nothing more than the superstitious veneration paid to their goddess, Velleda. As well argue that the marriage relation was respected and that woman was held in high esteem in Rome because the Vestals were sacred, or that the domestic relations of the French were singularly pure, because they worshipped a female in the Cathedral of Notre Dame. Surely there is nothing in this whereon to build an argument, or that would take from Christianity the credit of erecting the two main pillars which support the edifice of European civilization. While we may be willing to admit that the barbarians of Tacitus, who, we are told, kept several wives, not for lust, but for distinction, had some correct ideas on the marriage relation and the dignity of woman, it is not at all probable that their manners were improved by time. Their contact with Romans did not tend to the development of this or any other element of moral duty.

When Vortigern was pressed by Pict and Scot, there was no Tacitus to extol their virtues, but there very many like Sidonius, Bishop of Clermont, who exclaimed: "Happy your eyes who do not see them; happy your ears who do not hear them." Of all the tribes that composed the German race, none was more formidable, none more savage than the Saxons, whom this unfortunate monarch, in the year 449, enlisted in his service. For centuries they were the scourge of surrounding nations, pillage and piracy being their means of livelihood. In brief, they were barbarians, robbers, idolators, slave makers, slave owners, slave dealers, thoroughly illiterate and inhumanly cruel. Such they remained until Christianity, borne on the wings of love, came to regenerate and transform them. That it succeeded we have seen, and also that to its success is attributable not only the wisdom of their customs, laws and institutions, but their continuance on the land which their injustice had wrung from its rightful owners. The

spirit of the Church was felt in the *witenagemote*, in the *hundred-gemote* and in the *scyre-gemote*; in other words, in the legislature and the courts. The school, the college, the pulpit and the confessional gave it almost absolute sway over the minds and hearts of the people, and this sway was exercised for their elevation. Viewing these powers, and bearing in mind what the Anglo-Saxon was before his conversion, how absurd is any hypothesis that would deprive the Church of whatever there is to be found of beauty and grandeur in the laws and customs of Alfred, of Edgar and of Edward, monarchs whose lives shine like stars in the diadem of Christian Rome, and whose impression on the Constitution of England has not been, and cannot be, effaced.

To pass from the Anglo-Saxon to the Dane is like steering from Charybdis to Scylla. The Dane was robbery, lust and murder personified. His life was dedicated to crime from the cradle. At his mother's breast he was taught to emulate, by land and sea, the atrocities of his ancestors, and to despise honest industry. To form an estimate of him, it is unnecessary to follow his pirate banner wherever booty beckoned, for the history of England sufficiently attests his cupidity, selfishness and brutality. Had not the Church conquered him, the Anglo-Saxon would, in all probability, have shared the fate of the Briton. That it did conquer him is the best evidence of the power it had on the mind, heart, manners, customs and laws of the people within its fold.

Nor will the advent of the Norman help those who reject the claims of the Church. With the volume of history open before us, we have no hesitancy in saying that a blacker villain never polluted the moral atmosphere of any nation. Take from him the glamour which poets and romancists have thrown around him and he stands before us the colossal ruffian of the ages. With some show of religion in hours of weakness and danger, he was the embodiment of bloodthirstiness and selfishness, as, in health and strength, he rode forth on prancing steed. His heart was as impenetrable as his armor, and his hand as merciless as the pestilence. If sometimes he exhibited the qualities of the Grecian athlete or the Roman gladiator, he was oftener the cowardly assassin and the ruthless destroyer of the helpless and innocent. What the wolf is to the sheep was he to the people, and had not the Church grappled with him, not a stone upon a stone of the grand edifice of civilization, which it took her centuries to rear, would have remained. Never did the Church put forth more power. All her resources of head and heart, all her treasures of human and divine knowledge were called into requisition, and she needed them all. Hitherto she had open, courageous enemies; but the Norman fought her and her children often wearing the mask of the sanctuary, and sometimes involving the sanctuary in his crimes.

But, grant that he was all that his most extravagant eulogists claim for him; deck him in the gaudy trappings of romance; drink in the songs of the troubadours; let imagination take wing until he stands before you the soul of all that is generous, noble, valorous, the very personification of chivalry, and you but multipli the glories and triumphs, the laurels and trophies of the Church; for, when she measured forces with him, he was reeking in every crime to which humanity is heir, the equal in iniquity of his Danish brother. How prophetic the tears shed by Charlemagne, as, standing by the waves of the Mediterranean, he descried the vessels of him who, in this age, would be called the enemy of mankind.

Now it must be evident, even to the merest historical smatterer, that these tribes or nations, as the Church met and confronted them, were not only incapable of bringing English liberty to that degree of perfection which, according to Hallam, it had attained before the sceptre passed from the Plantagenets, but that, owing to their selfish motives of action, their restlessness, their hatred of restraint, their passions, they were utterly unfit to form any permanent government.

Guizot, in his third lecture, after ascribing to the barbarians, to whom he was partial, the sentiment of personal liberty, of human individualism, says: "In a state of extreme rudeness and ignorance, this sentiment is mere selfishness, in all its brutality; with all its unsociability. Such was its character from the fifth to the eighth century among the Germans. They cared for nothing beyond their own interests, for nothing beyond the gratification of their own passions, their own inclinations; how, then, could they accommodate themselves, in any tolerable degree, to the social condition? The attempt was made to bring them into it; they endeavored of themselves to enter into it; but an act of improvidence, a burst of passion, a lack of intelligence, soon threw them back to their old position. At every instant, we see attempts made to form man into a social state, and at every instant we see them overthrown by the failings of man, by the absence of the moral conditions necessary to its existence." Further on, in the same lecture, speaking of the causes that led to the termination of this state, we find the following just tribute to the Church: "A third cause, and one which readily presents itself to every one, was the Christian Church. The Christian Church was a regularly constituted society; having its maxims, its rules, its discipline, together with an ardent desire to extend its influence, to conquer its conquerors. Among the Christians of this period, in the Catholic clergy there were men of profound and varied learning; men who had thought deeply, who were versed in ethics and politics; who had formed definite opinions and vigorous notions



upon all subjects; who felt a praiseworthy zeal to propagate information, and to advance the cause of learning. No society ever made greater efforts than the Christian Church did, from the fifth to the tenth century, to influence the world around it, and to assimilate it to itself."

\* That the Church did assimilate to itself Anglo-Saxon, Dane, and Norman, admits of no doubt; and that, to this assimilation, however imperfect, alone belongs the glory of placing the liberties of England on a permanent basis, and of creating a system of jurisprudence that will live centuries after Macaulay's *New Zealander*, to bless the world, only folly or ignorance would question. Any other position, as we have said, and essayed to show, is unhistorical and irrational.

MICHAEL HENNESSY.

---

## ENGLISH KINGS AND ROMAN PONTIFFS.

*England and Rome; a History of the Relations between the Papacy and the English State and Church, from the Norman Conquest to the Revolution of 1688.* By T. Dunbar Ingram, LL.D.

*Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment;* by Lord Selborne.

IT is the misfortune of persons born in a National Church that they cannot grasp the idea of the Catholic Church. Their view is necessarily insular, fragmentary. Accustomed always to regard religion as opinionative,—for the logical reason that their Christianity is home made,—they argue about the Catholic Church as if it were only one of many churches which, eclectically, borrows some good points out of the others. In the two publications named above, we find the usual Protestant view of Roman corruptions. Mr. Ingram, who is a barrister, and who is well read in special grooves, holds a brief for the Anglican High Church Protestant party, and he does his duty to his client, and does it well. Lord Selborne thoroughly understands what he is writing about, within the limits of *ex parte* litigation. But neither the one nor the other can "take a bird's-eye view of the whole idea," because neither happened to be born inside the Church. Had they been born Catholics, or had they been converted to the faith, they might perhaps have reasoned in the following way:

The Catholic Church was founded by her Divine Lord, not for one race or nation but for the whole world. National Churches, therefore, integral in their own selves,—independent of the one supreme Teaching Authority,—are the exact opposite of the Idea, the Catholic Church. One God, one faith, one Visible, United Church is the Idea, as it is the fact, of Christianity. Now the very object of the Catholic Church being to unite all souls in one faith, the essential nature of the Catholic Church being divine, it follows that the Catholic Church and the world must be necessarily and always in antagonism. The Church represents obedience to the Divine Mind; the world represents obedience to the natural mind; hence it would be impossible in the nature of things that, through eighteen hundred and ninety-two years, the two powers should not be always in conflict. Just as a man's soul and body are always in conflict, each trying to persuade the other to its own side, so the spiritual and temporal powers must be always liable to get into conflict, since temporal powers are largely grounded on worldly principles. What wonder then that, in well-nigh two thousand years, there should have been well-nigh two thousand bitter struggles between the power which represents Almighty God and the power which represents original sin.

Yet both Mr. Ingram and Lord Selborne ignore a necessity which is at once the result of the activities of the Evil One, and of the exercise of the Church's power for his overthrow. If there were *not* perpetual conflicts, the Church would not be divine. Like her Founder, the Church is a Teacher; she instructs, she admonishes, she threatens; and when all gentle measures fail, she excommunicates, yet always in the hope of reconciliation. It is precisely with powers as with persons; with the collective force of a government as with its subjects. The Church is placed in the world to protect the nations against tyrants; to use all her spiritual weapons for their security; and, conversely, through eighteen centuries, bishops, priests and laity have looked to the Holy See to defend their liberties. Why, then, throw the blame on Catholic authority, because many natural misunderstandings have arisen between pontiffs and kings, between national hierarchies and their civil governors, between the often powerless religious orders and great nobles, seeing that the very object of the spiritual power, both as regards nations and individuals, is to bring good influences to counteract evil ones.

Nor is it any excuse to say: "But the spiritual power has not unfrequently been injudicious." Protestant critics forget that, during the Middle Ages, the tactical difficulties of the pontiffs were often cruel. Removed by immense distance from the scenes of conflicts, where feudal lords or worldly monarchs were running

riot; fearing to offend those in power lest they should injure the liberties of their dependents, and knowing well that their insistence on what was right must be tempered by at least the semblance of compromise, they were often made to seem to side with wrong from their eagerness to avoid harming whole communities. Mr. Ingram speaks of the moral corruptions of some of the clergy, such as the abuse of simony, of non-residence, of plural benefices, or the abuses in expectations and reservations, as though the ecclesiastical authorities were solely responsible for a state of things which was as world-begotten as it was infinitely regrettable. No one denies the existence of such abuses,—their magnitude has of course been over-stated, while the holy side of the Church's influence has not been dwelt upon,—yet the answer is that, for centuries, the feudal power was so dominant that the ecclesiastical power had to fight against great odds. A fair question is: If even the Catholic Church was often powerless in restraining the worldly propensities of great nobles, what would weak Protestantism have effected under the same conditions? Spiritual rule had to contend against brute force. Accepted principles had to contend against accepted facts. A distant pontiff had to decide on delicate questions, involving the class-privileges of established lords, and, while advancing every moral motive for reform, had to be careful not to foment social discord. In these days we can scarcely realize the whole difficulties of the very distant and solely spiritual Supreme Pontiffs. The refinements of pontifical tact were terribly tasked. It is scarcely fair of Mr. Ingram to bring so broad an accusation as "The Popes recognized no distinction between things secular and sacred." Such a remark betrays an animus which is unfitting in a careful writer, who should put the proper share of the blame on the right shoulders.

And another truth which this class of writers overlook is that the Catholic Church has its human side and its divine side; its human side being its fallibility in worldly prudence, and its divine side its infallibility in faith and morals. Mr. Ingram does not say a word against the divine side of the Catholic Church; he only says a good deal against its human side. And wholly apart from the fact that he makes statements as to the human side which we should pronounce to be, in mild language, misapprehensive, we may say frankly that no one who is not a Catholic can distinguish between the human side and the divine side. The points of contact between the Church and the world are so confused by the noisy wickedness of the latter, that unless a man be both Catholic saint and theologian he cannot write down the definitions of such points. We have all seen a ship tumbled about by angry waves, the captain trimming his sails or changing his course; and though we may



know that the captain is a master of navigation, we know also that he cannot change the wind or sea, and that his science, his fortitude, his pure intention are no pledges that he may not be worsted. How much more difficult is the conflict of the Church with the world; the wind blowing from all quarters, not from one quarter; deception, mendacity, trickery, immorality, all contending together in human storm; while the spiritual power has to do two things apparently irreconcilable—insist on right principles and assuage enmities. In eighteen hundred years, while these conflicts have been going on,—conflicts between divine principles and human wickedness, between holy suggestion and stubborn pride, between the saintly diplomacy of Catholic authority and the crafty intrigues of secular statesmen or courtiers,—the wonder is, not that there have been some scandals, but that the Catholic Church has come out of the long fray with no worse injury than wordy blows.

## II.

After all, what was the controversy which was always raging—the controversy between the spiritual and the temporal? Was it a controversy about the *possession* of spiritual powers, or a controversy only as to their *exercise*? It was the latter. No king or noble, before Henry VIII., disputed the Church's possession of spiritual powers—including the spiritual primacy of the Holy See. The whole controversy was always, as Father S. F. Smith, S. J., has clearly put it, on the question of the "frontiers" of the two powers. Those two powers, the spiritual and the temporal, were, as we have said, necessarily in conflict; the only grounds of quarrel being "where is the frontier line?" and "who shall judge its delicate limitations?" Now it is manifest to common sense that, since the powers of the Catholic Church are superior to the powers of earthly sovereigns—superior because the divine is above the human—therefore also the Catholic Church must be sole arbiter on the subject of the limitations of her spiritual frontier. This truth was normally admitted by kings and nations, as a truth which, in the abstract, was undeniable. But where the controversy derived its bitterness was from this pleading: that the temporal power would urge that the spiritual power had misunderstood what were the exact bearings of a particular case in dispute, and on this plea would proceed to contest, not the legitimacy of the spiritual power, but the legitimacy of its exercise under a misapprehension.

It was always an axiom with the Church, as it was an axiom with the Catholic States, that temporal sovereignties were independent as to things temporal. The Church never dreamed of interfering with temporal matters, any more than did Catholic States

with things spiritual. The whole dispute was always: "is this your province or is it mine?" or to put it with better accuracy: "have you sufficiently understood the premises, to make sure under which province this point comes?" And seeing that, up to the other day, the means of inter-communication were most difficult—no steam, no electricity, not even roads—it was a matter of course that the long intervals of inter-communication should be utilized "diplomatically" by worldly suitors. It was so easy to misrepresent the real issue. Two parties in a home-suit, each employing their advocates, could manage to confuse a cause at Rome so successfully, that it is a marvel how the pontiffs could have been so well informed as they were through the centuries of such long drawn out controversies.

This point being admitted, we may now ask the question, was there ever any controversy in which the pontiffs made the mistake of over-stepping their (acknowledged) spiritual power? After reading the two books mentioned above, it is a permissible inference, there was not. Misunderstandings, and a great many of them; withdrawals of censures, not made on assured grounds; errors of judgment as to the best time or means; all such "human side" of the Church's actions may be legitimately discussed; with the conclusion that there were sometimes grave mistakes; but in all English history (and it is of England that our two authors write), we may assert that there is no instance of a Pope stultifying his divine office, by confusing divine principles with human principles.

### III.

If there were such an instance, when was it? Shall we say that we might look for incentives to such "stultification" in one or other of the five following grooves: (1) in the contests of a sovereign with a pontiff; (2) in the contests of a sovereign with English bishops; (3) in the contests of English bishops with a pontiff; (4) in the contests of English Catholics with their bishops; (5) in the contests of English Catholics with a pontiff. Let us run down English history, and briefly touch on such instances, as *primâ facie*, might afford pleas for accusation.

The first contest on which Anglicans lay stress is in regard to the keeping of Easter in the sixth century. (This was before the time of the Norman kings, but since the contest is assumed to come under the category of "the contests of English Catholics with a pontiff"—more accurately of the scattered British Catholics with a missionary—we may discuss the case as included within our argument). It will not be necessary however to say much about it, for the subject was alluded to in a recent paper in this

REVIEW (under the title of "The Anglican Theory of Continuity"), and we need therefore only make the following remark: The Roman pontiffs never insisted on the abandoning of national *customs*, provided only such customs were thoroughly Christian. Thus Pope St. Gregory himself, who sent Augustine to England, charged him, "You know the custom of the Roman Church in which you were brought up. It pleases me that if you have found anything in the Roman, or the Gallican, or any other Church, which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, you carefully make observance of the same." And again, the same Pope said, "Where the faith is one, differences of custom do not damage Holy Church." Now this "liberality" is misunderstood by such Anglicans as confuse local customs with points of faith. The contest of the Britons with Augustine, while it is sufficiently explicable by the angry times in which they lived, was no more "a contest of English bishops with a pontiff," or of English or British Catholics with a pontiff, than would have been the refusal of British priests to wear the tonsure—like the Roman priests; to fast on Saturdays as well as on Fridays—like the Romans; or to place a cross on the front instead of on the back of a Mass-vestment, according to the "custom" still preserved throughout Italy. Not one Anglican in a thousand cares to remember such distinctions; to note the difference between national habits and Catholic faith; just as not one Anglican in a thousand cares to note the historic fact, that the British Easter was the original Roman Easter. And it is perhaps well that we should begin our survey with an example of a contest which obviously did not rest on faith or morals; for we have to show that no contest in English history ever rested upon either (that is, upon definitions of either); all contests being as to limitation of frontier; as to the over-stepping of the frontier by either litigant.

Before, however, we come to the Conquest, let three remarks be made, in regard to the early kings and the early Church. (1) In the Calendar of the Old English Church, we find the names of (about) three hundred canonized saints; more than half of whom were of royal birth or connection. Now canonization has always been Rome-conferred; and we may be quite sure that no prince would have been canonized, nor indeed any person of either sex or of any degree, unless he, or she, had been loyal to the Holy See. (2) Monasteries and convents were built all over England for a long while before the time of the Conquest; and from these religious houses were diffused religion and education; Glastonbury Ely, Ramsey, Malmesbury, with many others, suggesting memories of early pontifical jurisdiction. Now these religious houses were approved, and often endowed, by the kings in whose domin-



ions they were established. So that their existence may be said to show two things—both of them very pertinent to our argument—that the religion of early England was Roman Catholic, and that the early English kings were of the same faith. (3) It was before the Conquest that St. Dunstan, Abbot of Glastonbury, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, reproved the vices of the tyrant king Edwy; and subsequently the same archbishop reproved Edwy's successor, Edgar; and even obliged him, by way of penance, to lay aside his crown for seven years, to fast twice a week, and to distribute copies of the Holy Scriptures to every county. Now we shall not be straining a point if we go so far as to say, that such a fact proves that all England was Roman Catholic. To imagine that any Archbishop who was an "Anglican" could have ventured to inflict such chastisement upon his king, is as absurd as to suppose that a king who was a Protestant would have submitted to such outrageous presumption. To gravely argue such an "Anglican case" would provoke a smile. We therefore conclude that a king's obedience to an archbishop proves all that we have any need to prove in our argument. Just as the sanctity which could merit canonization; and the canonization itself, Rome-conferred; with the existence of religious houses all over England, were sufficient evidence of the Roman pontiffs' jurisdiction, so the bold defiance of a king by an archbishop, with the subsequent submission of that king to the imposed penance, are proof positive that the spiritual power was Roman Catholic.

We come now to the days of the Norman conquest. In the historic resistances of the archbishops Anselm, Winchelsea, and Thomas à Becket, who all warred with the sovereigns of their day, we find no contest as to doctrine, as to morals, nor even to discipline; we find only pretexts set up by the temporal power for the evasion of the acknowledged rights of the spiritual power. In the case of St. Anselm, let it be first asked, who were his enemies, who his friends? King William Rufus was his chief enemy; a would-be emperor, autocrat and tyrant. Yet even he wrote to the Pope that "he deferred to and obeyed his sacred commands with humility" . . . and that in the matter of appeals to the pontiff he only claimed that "no cleric belonging to his kingdom should pass beyond the borders of his kingdom on account of any *civil cause*, unless he had previously ascertained whether he could obtain his rights by the king's authority." This same king who quarrelled with St. Anselm, in regard to the limits of appeals to the Holy See, also quarrelled with him because he had recognized Pope Urban as the true Pope; King Rufus pretending to nominate the *Apostolicus*, just as the Emperor of Germany claimed to do so. Here was no sort of assumption of spiritual authority, or of

refusal of that authority to the chief chair, but only a vain, imperial claim to be so mighty that every one must bow down to his authority. Be it remembered that in those times, in England, there were two absolutely independent jurisdictions; each one employing its own means to defend itself from real or from apparent encroachment. The kings used their prohibitions, to prevent hasty recourse to Rome; the pontiffs, in extreme cases, used excommunication, when all other means of settlement had been exhausted. In the subsequent contest about investiture, between St. Anselm and King Henry (and in regard to which Pope Gregory VII. had legislated) the archbishop refused to allow King Henry to confer investiture, or even so much as to hold communion with those clerics to whom he, the king, had given investiture; because the Pope had already legislated on the matter, to avoid confusion of spiritual with temporal claim. The whole country was with St. Anselm in his resistance; mere courtiers only were on the side of King Henry. But the point to be observed is that bishops, priests, and laity were convinced that to receive investiture at the hands of a layman, even though that layman were the king, was the confusing of the temporal with the spiritual; and this confusion was always sought to be avoided by the whole action of the pontiffs in early times. No lay authority denied the spiritual power; no spiritual authority denied the lay power; the contest was between ambitious worldly governors, who desired to magnify their own importance, and faithful clergy who saw the danger that was imminent, and endured persecution to avoid it.

To take a later case in history, when Pope Boniface VIII., A.D. 1261, forbade the English clergy to yield to the royal demands on Church property, until the consent of the Holy See had been obtained, Archbishop Winchelsea at once promulgated the Bull. But it appeared good to the English bishops that some concession should be made, because the war with Scotland was occasioning great ravages. Accordingly the bishops represented to the Holy See that some exception might be made in the present need; and the necessary concession was therefore granted. Here was the illustration of three truisms, always transparent in English history: (1) that the Pope claimed all spiritual legislation; (2) that the civil power admitted the claim in principle; (3) that the pontiffs were always willing to grant reasonable concessions, when the whole truth of any case had been put before them.

Every one knows that St. Thomas à Becket was a martyr-champion of the rights of the Holy See; but for what particular right was it that he stood up? Now here we may touch lightly on some "legal" points, by way of estimating the sublime martyrdom of St. Thomas. "The Angel of the Church's liberty," as St.

Thomas has been well called, may well excuse us for dwelling one moment on certain of the major, special difficulties of his career.

#### IV.

Such words as appeals, investitures, prohibitions, provisors, stir up a confused storm in the mind, when we remember their uses in English history. More wrath has been expended over those uses, and more misapprehension has surrounded their exact force, than have disturbed any other branches of law, whether ecclesiastical or civil. Appeal is a simple word, and every one knows what it means; but we may begin by observing that the very custom of appeal proves the universal recognition of the Pontificate. In the present day there is no spiritual head of the "Established" Church; so there can be no question of purely spiritual appeal, and no question of "prohibitions," on special grounds. In Catholic times the co-existence of two headships, the one purely spiritual and independent, the other purely temporal and independent, necessarily led to occasional friction in *practice*, though seldom to any friction in *principle*. The king had no equal or superior in temporal matters; the Pope had no equal or superior in spiritual matters; prohibition meaning the preventing of carrying "mixed" causes to Rome, on the ground of their being partly temporal causes. William the Conqueror and his two sons introduced certain new "customs"—"wicked customs and liberties," as Matthew of Paris called them, and "dignities detestable in God's eyes," for the simple reason that their worldly greed and pride were in excess of their Catholic aspirations. And from their example arose constant petty controversies, which had scarcely been heard of till the eleventh century; such as questionings as to the authentication of Papal Bulls; as to the rights of presentation to benefices; as to the precise province of an appeal made by clerics: "was it purely spiritual, or also temporal?" And from this temper on the part of a few of the English kings arose the necessity for some of the pontiffs to remonstrate—as did Pope Martin V., A.D. 1426, when he wrote to Archbishop Chicheley about the statutes of provisors and *præmunire*—because "the king had sanctioned laws concerning churches, clerics, and the ecclesiastical state; drawing spiritual and ecclesiastical causes to himself, just as if the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were put in his hands." Thus both sides sometimes contended, not on the divine right of the pontiff, and not on the temporal right of the civil power, but on the points of limitation or application. The clergy too were sometimes so hard driven, in having to obey tyrants in the temporal order, while also obeying pontiffs in the spiritual order, that it was difficult for them to act with sublime fortitude. As some of St. Anselm's clergy



said to him in their grievous dilemma: "We cannot rise to a sublimity of life like yours, or join you in making scorn of the world." Just as the Catholic clergy in the days of Queen Elizabeth had to choose between apostasy and martyrdom, so was it in a minor degree with the Catholic clergy, throughout the reigns of the more worldly of the English monarchs. Yet even these worldly monarchs do not appear to have lost the faith; they only did—what is quite common in the present day—confess to principles while leading faithless lives. These worldly kings did not say "we repudiate the Pope's authority," or "we consider the temporal power to have jurisdiction over the spiritual power" (as both Henry VIII. and Elizabeth boldly affirmed, equally by their deeds and by their words); they only said: "We find it convenient for our self-pleasing, that we should determine the legal exercise of that spiritual power, which, as Catholics, we of course venerate and obey."

And now, to return to St. Thomas à Becket. We only left him that we might the better apprehend the quarrels, which the Norman kings were the first to generate, between Church and State. It was A.D. 1161, when Henry II., the first Plantagenet, appointed his Chancellor, Thomas à Becket, to be archbishop in succession to Archbishop Theobald, who had just died. (The appointment or selection rested with the king, subject to the after-approval of the pontiff.) Annoyed, that his gay and brilliant chancellor became instantly transformed into an ascetic churchman, the king was wroth beyond control when the new archbishop boldly declared himself to be the champion of the ancient liberties of the Church. The "new customs" of the Conqueror and his two sons, which Henry II. chose to call "the ancient laws and customs of the kingdom," were repudiated by Archbishop à Becket, in those plain simple words which conveyed the whole mind of the Catholic Church on the subject: "The spiritual authority of my archbishopric I hold from the Pope, the temporal revenues from the king." Henry had resolved to bring all causes into the Royal Court, equally those of clerics and of laymen; and he summoned the bishops to submit to the "Constitutions of Clarendon," which decreed these four detestable impieties: (1) the king was to dispose of all benefices; (2) to enjoy the revenues of all benefices while vacant; (3) to prevent any cleric from leaving the kingdom without his leave; (4) to insist that appeals from the Primate should be made to the Crown, not, as heretofore, to the Holy See. Armed knights, with drawn swords, stood in the antechamber of the bishops to compel obedience to these new impious statutes. Under fear most of the bishops consented. The Archbishop stood firm in his refusal. "I appeal to the decision of the Pope," he affirmed;

"and under the protection of the Catholic Church and the Apostolic See I now depart." The king banished him straightway from the kingdom. For seven years the Archbishop remained in exile; and then, under a feigned promise from the king, was restored to his country and to his See. Within a very few months of this restoration, the king uttered the too memorable words: "Of all the cowards in my service, is there not one that will rid me of this turbulent priest?" The answer was the terribly historic crime—not surpassed for sacrilege in English history—which secured for the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket a world's homage. And then, in the following year, the king stood in Canterbury Cathedral, with his hand on the Book of the Gospels on the high altar, and swore to abolish all "customs" contrary to the liberty of the Church, and do penance for his own share in the Archbishop's murder.

Now, three points come out here in such clearness that it is enough to note them without adding any comment: (1) Archbishop à Becket was a saint, and he therefore knew what was the mind of the Catholic Church; (2) the Pope had the power—which the whole Christian world conceded to him—of compelling a king's submission to the Holy See; (3) the king, in doing penance at the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket, not only confessed to his faith in the Pope's supremacy, but proved that the faith of the whole nation was at least as earnest as his own, since he had to humble himself in the eyes of all his subjects.

Let us now take a glance at another instance of a similar kind—the contest of King John with the Holy See. Perhaps, in this instance we shall trace, even more emphatically, the faith of all Christendom as well as of Britain. The archbishopric of Canterbury being vacant, some of the monks, at the king's command, elected as primate John de Gray, while another party in the same monastery chose their sub-prior, Reginald, and sent him to Rome for confirmation. The pontiff rejected both candidates, and chose in their stead Stephen Langton, whom he consecrated A.D. 1207. John swore that Langton should never re-enter England, and proceeded to seize the lands of the monks of Canterbury. He threatened to pluck out the eyes and to cut off the noses of all who should go to Rome to make appeal; and so mad was he in his hatred of holy things, that the pontiff, as the only resource that was left to him, placed the kingdom of England under an interdict.

For six years two national evils went on—the one the spiritual consequences of the interdict, the other the king's tyranny over his subjects. At length, the pontiff excommunicated the rebel king, who, being worsted in his battle with Philip of France, had

to submit to the conditions which were imposed upon him. Standing in the open air, outside the west door of the cathedral, the king swore to abolish all the "new customs," and to restore the ecclesiastical laws of St. Edward. The cathedral doors were then thrown open to the faithful—the first time after six years of interdict—and High Mass was celebrated in thanksgiving.

Shortly afterwards the English barons exacted from King John the "Great Charter," which was to secure English liberties. Of this Charter, it suffices to name only the concessions which, directly or indirectly, affected religion; namely, that the Church was to be free in all things spiritual, and to enjoy her old liberties as before the Conquest. Needless to enter here into the story of the misunderstanding between the Pontiff, the king, and his barons, or to detail the horrors of the king's enmity against the bishops, the barons, and the poor monks; the wretched tyrant died in the heat of his antagonism, so that peace came by his death to the Church and nation. We trace here, as in the instance of St. Thomas à Becket, the grand historic fact of English faithfulness. We are told by Anglican writers—of whom we have specially referred to two—that the Reformation was but a recurrence to that demand for freedom which was almost national in its range and its emphasis, for, did not the conqueror, his two sons, Henry II., and King John, all try to get the better of the pontiff? Shallow reasoning! The kings referred to represented only themselves; they did not represent the clergy, the people, or even the barons; their only supporters were the worldly courtiers who looked for favor, or the unmanly minority who preferred perfidy to persecution. But let us go a little into the details of this last controversy between King John and his clergy and the pontiff: (1) The pontiff claimed the right, and had the power, to choose whom he would for an English primate. (2) The pontiff claimed the right and had the power, to put England under an interdict for six years. (3) King John had to submit to the spiritual power, *because* the whole English nation believed in it. (4) The barons, when they insisted on "Magna Charta," insisted also on the spiritual *and* temporal liberties which the Church had enjoyed before the Conquest. (5) The barons and the people, like the bishops and the clerics, were all agreed as to the two main points in dispute—that the spiritual power was independent of the temporal power; and that the spiritual power must determine its own limits. Nor can any one justly accuse the spiritual power of having been tyrannical; for, its efforts were wholly in the direction of securing popular liberties, as had been the case in Henry the Second's quarrel with St. Thomas à Becket, or William Rufus's, or Henry the First's quarrel with St. Anselm.



## V.

But *all* the English kings were not wilful ; the majority of them were faithful to their religion. Mr. Ingram—whose book has been briefly noticed—assumes that the pontiffs were often encroaching on the temporal power ; so that the temporal power had often to act on the defensive. In the same way, Lord Selborne seems to start with a sort of postulate, that the Holy See needed always to be kept in check. A good many English Catholic kings thought otherwise. We might do well, perhaps, to go back to pre-Norman times ; to the often disturbed but always loyal “Early English Church.” We have already said something about these times, but they are so instructive that we may do well to recur to them. Just before the Norman conquest—we may take instances as they occur to us—Catholic Wales set the world good examples. “Howel the Good” went to Rome to beg of the Pope a benediction on his new laws, ecclesiastical and civil. And, not far off, the Dukes of Brittany, about the same period, paid such obedience to the Head of God’s Church that their ambassadors put on record this declaration : “Our forefathers, from the hour they became Christians, were never guilty of apostasy ; they lived up to Rome’s laws ; and to the commands of the Roman See they never offered opposition.” The kings also of the Saxon Heptarchy were always loyal—the exceptions were so rare that they proved the rule. “I, Wiltred, an earthly king, . . . forbid to all kings our successors, and to ealdormen and all laymen, any lordship whatever over the churches.” And so, too, Kenulf, King of Mercia, wrote that he deemed “it fitting to incline the ear of his obedience, with all due humility, to the pontiff’s holy commands.” The Anglo-Saxon “Chronicle” says that, A.D. 780, “King Alfwold sent to Rome for a Pall and invested Eanbald as archbishop.” Moreover, a score of witnesses attest that the Pope’s writ ran in England and that the Saxon hierarchy executed it religiously. Ten kings of the Saxons crossed the Alps to pay homage to the Supreme Ruler of the Church : Cœadwalla, Ine, Offa, Cænred, Offa, Siric, Burhed, Eardulf, Ethelwulf, and Canute the Dane. So also did the Queens Frythogithe and Ethelburga. King Cœadwalla went to Rome to be baptized. The Anglo-Saxon “Chronicle” notices that, A.D. 853, “King Ethelwulf sent his son Alfred to Rome, and Pope Leo consecrated him king and took him for his son at confirmation.” St. Edward, the last of the Saxon kings, being unable to go to Rome, begged a commutation of his vow from the Holy See, and the result was the historic Westminster Abbey. It should be mentioned that, A.D. 808, Eardwulf, King of Northumbria, being deposed, went to Rome to plead his cause with the Pope, and the

Pope sent his legate back with the restored king. Bede says that the Roman pilgrimage—a pious practice in early times, though accompanied by fearful hardships and risks—was accomplished by crowds, noble and ignoble; and always, too, with the commendation of the king. It is told also in the “Chronicles” that for some reason, in 889, no Roman pilgrimage was made, “except that King Alfred sent two couriers with letters.” And while we are thinking of Saxon times, let it be mentioned that Kings Egbert and Oswy—so says Bede—“sent presents to the Apostolic Pope, and many presents of gold and silver.” So, too, King Kenulf, of Mercia, despatched to Rome an annual sum of 365 mancuses, to “support the poor and to supply oil for the numerous lamps in St. Peter’s.” Ethelwulf, King of Wessex, lavished gifts on the pontiffs, and sent four dishes of silver gilt for Pope Benedict III.; and in his last will he ordered a continuance of his gifts, “in honor of St. Peter, specially to buy oil for the lights of the church.” The Anglo-Saxon “Chronicle” records that the alms of King Alfred were carried four times to Rome with much ceremony; and William of Malmesbury writes that King Ethelwulf “went to Rome and there offered to St. Peter that tribute which England pays to this day;” alluding to what we now call Peter’s Pence. King Canute, the Dane, was inexorable as to this Roman money, enjoining his subjects to pay “the Peter’s Pence, according to the ancient law,” the legislation of the last of the Saxon kings mentioning “half a mark” as the tax to be imposed by “Danish law,” payment to be received between the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul and the festival known as *Ad vincula*.

Now, all this was before the time of the Norman Conquest, when the “new customs,” so much approved by Anglican writers, were supposed to curb the Anglo-Roman communications. They did not curb them. The communications went on as in the old time. Besides, William the Conqueror was not so bad as he is painted. Collier, the Anglican historian, says that, “though he took care to make the most of his crown, and, it may be, strained his prerogative too far upon the Church in some cases, yet he never carried the point so far as to depose any Bishop.” Nor did the Conqueror ever interfere with the Church’s liturgy or doctrine, or with the exercise of her purely spiritual discipline; he only “parted the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions,” ordering that “no cause relating to the discipline and government of the Church should be brought before a secular magistrate.” And so satisfied was the pontiff with William’s loyalty to the Holy See that he wrote to him in the most flattering terms. Indeed, the Conqueror appears to have alternated between admirable loyalty and worldly pride. His two sons leaned rather to the worldly pride. Still, even they

never disputed the Pope's supremacy. Had we space to run down the line of English kings we should find that, with but very few exceptions, they all admitted, and also acted upon, Catholic principles, their only temptation being to exaggerate their own sovereignty by claiming the right to define papal limitations.

## VI.

There can be no better proof that "the temporal" and "the spiritual" were always kept distinct in Catholic times, and that the kings of the middle ages never presumed to touch the spiritual,—and so preserved the Catholic unity of belief,—than the clean sweep of Catholic doctrine which followed on the Reformation, which was the usurpation of the spiritual by the temporal. As long as the English kings obeyed the Pope in things spiritual (merely showing a little temper in their diplomacy), doctrine was never touched in the least particular; but the moment the Pontiff's primacy was repudiated, away went the whole body of Catholic truth. Mr. Ingram is our authority for this last fact, though he fails to draw the inference which should be patent. He says: "The whole outward aspect of religion was altered, as it were, *in a moment*, and the ancient practices, however innocent and inoffensive, were banned as superstitions. Customs and ceremonial consecrated by immemorial antiquity, and endeared by a thousand associations, were scornfully repressed. Contemporaneously with the changes in *discipline and doctrine*, England presented a scene of havoc and desecration, never before witnessed in a Christian country." The inevitable consequence of repudiating Christ's vicar! But we may at least gather this one satisfaction from the hideous consequences of the apostasy, that they *proved* that, in all the controversies of the Catholic kings, there was no idea of disobedience to the pontiff. We may use the word *proved*, because the argument stands thus, to put it in a perfectly legitimate form: Disobedience to the spiritual authority of the Pope generated the thousand sects of English Protestantism; just as it shivered into atoms the Church of England, leaving the Church *in* England perfectly united. But no schism, no sectarianism, had ever afflicted the Church in England so long as Catholics remained steadfast to the Holy See. Therefore (1) the consequence of disobedience was infinite division, and (2) conversely, the unity which prevailed throughout the middle ages *proved* the faithfulness of kings and people to Roman Catholicism.

The strange thing is that writers of marked ability should insist that "Protestant principles" were largely English all down the long centuries of the ages of faith while yet there was no division, no heresy (Wickliffe's riot, A.D. 1360, was not a heresy in



a doctrinal sense; we might call it an ecclesiastical socialism, and it came to nothing in the way of causing any schism); yet when they have to confess that Elizabethanism wrought chaos, they wholly dissociate the chaos from the disobedience. We have nothing to do with the private "views" of Protestant writers; but we are content to take our stand on this simple reasoning: The rejection of the papal supremacy begat chaos—chaos in all doctrine and all discipline; there was not a suspicion even of chaos in doctrine or in (spiritual) discipline during the whole of the ages preceding the Reformation; therefore we assume that there could not have been disobedience, in any sense that can be doctrinally called spiritual, in the conduct of kings and people during those ages.

## VII.

The recent decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (August 2, 1892), in the appeal against the judgment of the Archbishop of Canterbury respecting the ritualism of the Anglican Bishop of Lincoln, is sufficient proof, if one were wanting, of the awful consequences of the rejection of the final spiritual authority of the Holy See. An Anglican bishop was accused by lay promoters of being "Roman Catholic" in certain excesses of his ritual. Barred by a statute of the Arches Court, the promoters had to carry their cause to the Judicial Committee, who referred them to the Archbishop's Court for a judgment. But that court had been obsolete for two centuries. It was, however, resuscitated for this occasion, and, when resuscitated, the Bishop of Lincoln disputed the jurisdiction of even this resuscitated court of the archbishop. He however subsequently accepted it, while the promoters appealed unsuccessfully against it. Thousands of pounds have been expended to obtain a judgment, and the judgment includes these two items: (1) The words of the hymn called *Agnus Dei* are "not likely to be abused to any kind of *idolatrous adoration* except by those who would make for themselves other opportunities for it"; and (2) It appears to be suggested that the eastward position at the Holy Table is significant of the act of the priest being a *sacrificial* one. The archbishop has pointed out that, *in his opinion*, this view is erroneous. Here, then, we have the "judicial" ultimate: (1) That there is no "*idolatrous adoration*" in the Church of England; (2) That Anglican priests do *not* perform a "*sacrificial*" act during any part of what is called the Communion Service; (3) That the Archbishop of Canterbury has expressed his "*opinion*" that this is so.

Now contrast this particular strife, and its issue, with any strife, and its issue, during the Middle Ages. We have these three

grand distinctions: (1) A civil court tries a purely spiritual cause; (2) A civil court decides against "idolatrous adoration" and against the "sacrificial" character of the Anglican priesthood; (3) The archbishop is declared by this civil court to hold "opinions" which are in harmony with this judgment. Needless to say that no civil court in the Middle Ages, no civil court in the days of the early Church, would have even conceived the possibility of claiming such a jurisdiction, or of judicially affirming such heresies. While as to any Catholic archbishop holding "Protestant opinions," so flatly contradictory of the Catholic faith, well, from the time of Augustine to that of Warham, there was not one who could have even pictured such insanity. Imagine Archbishop Lanfranc (A.D. 1072) who wrote, "Verily, is it not ingrained in the consciences of all Christians that, in respect to St. Peter's successors no less than to himself, they must tremble at their threats, and yield joyful acclamation to their lofty graciousness?" or Archbishop Anselm (A.D. 1092) who wrote, "It is certain that he who does not obey the the ordinances of the Roman Pontiffs is disobedient to the Apostle Peter;" or St. Thomas of Canterbury (A.D. 1167) who wrote, "Who doubts that the Roman Church is the head of all the churches and the source of Christian doctrine?" or Archbishop Peckham (A.D. 1281) who wrote, "The Apostolic See has power to set aside rights (*dominari jure*) and can do what is for the welfare of the Christian people"; or Archbishop Winchelsea (A.D. 1296) who wrote to the Pope, "Robert kisses the sacred foot, with all promptitude to obey the papal mandates and precepts;" or Archbishop Bradwardine (A.D. 1349) who wrote, "I will commit myself to that ship which can never perish, the ship of Peter; for in it our only Head and Master, Christ, in safety sat and taught;" or Archbishop Warham (A.D. 1532) who wrote, "I neither intend to consent, nor with a clear conscience could consent, to any statute passed, or hereafter to be passed, in the Parliament, derogatory to the rights of the Holy See;" imagine all, or any one, of these Catholic English primates assenting to the wild heresies of the "Judicial Committee," or to its usurpation of jurisdiction in spiritual matters! And the testimonies of these archbishops (all English archbishops were the same) is proof positive that the faith of the nation was Catholic in every sense of the word; and that therefore the faith of the English kings must have been in harmony with that faith—at least sufficiently to make them *respect* the national faith. When we read in such Anglican books as we have noticed, that "the accession of Edward I. put an end to the alliance between the papacy and the crown of England"; or that, "At the time of Henry's accession, the Reformation was already in existence, and silently

working and fermenting in the minds of all men, popes, cardinals, and laymen" (two statements which are hazarded by Mr. Ingram) we can but think, "You wish these things to have been so, but you mistake the merely natural weaknesses of the human side of many Catholics for the interior faith and assured certainty of a whole nation. The "human side" of a good many Catholics has been always apparent. Human nature is not uprooted by the Catholic faith. Not all the Seven Sacraments can wholly obliterate the old leaven of the world, the flesh and the devil. But enough has been said to show that the entire English nation, kings, archbishops, clerics and laity, from the second to the sixteenth century of Christianity, "committed themselves," in the language of Archbishop Bradwardine, "to that ship which can never perish, the ship of Peter; for in it our only Head and Master, Christ, in safety sat and taught."

ARTHUR F. MARSHALL.

---



## CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS.

## No. 4. INGRATITUDE—MISFORTUNES—POSTHUMOUS HONORS.

THE return of Columbus from his fourth and last expedition to Spain, prostrated with disease, bending under advanced age, poor, neglected and unnoticed, and even hounded down in such extreme misfortunes by his enemies, is one of the saddest pictures in history. One of his vessels, the one he occupied, was disabled soon after leaving port, and had to be sent back to San Domingo, while he and his son and immediate followers had to go on the other ship, which was commanded by his brother Bartholomew. Other serious accidents, and repeated storms of severest violence, made the voyage an exhausting one, while he was himself prostrated on his bed by an accumulation of his old complaints. Rejecting every consideration in favor of stopping at the Azores for repairs, he hastened forward through storms and accidents, tempest tossed and almost in a dying state, until he reached Spain, San Lucar, and then Seville. The man who had given a New World to Spain had no home in Spain, and was forced to put up at an humble inn. Gladly would he have journeyed on to Medino del Campo, where the court then resided, but his sufferings made him helpless and unable to move. It happened that the friends he had in Seville were all absent; even the good and learned Gaspard Gorricio had then left his monastery. The Bureau of the Indies had grown to be an extensive admiralty administration, with many officials and employés, all under the presidency of Fonseca, his enemy. In fact he was in the city of his enemies. It is humbling to our humanity to relate that in such a direful extremity his enemies did not allow him repose or relief. Though aware of their renewed machinations, and that the rebels, who had attempted his life, were at large, protected and even received at court, he even now from his scanty means relieved the wants of the poor sailors whom he had brought back from Hispaniola, amongst whom were several of the rebels. He also earnestly and repeatedly commended to the court the payment of their dues. From his bed, he wrote an account of all his affairs to the sovereigns. The hands that had been fettered, and that now could not move without excruciating pain, penned letters of clearest statement to the Spanish sovereigns.

But the mental agonies of the venerable Admiral exceeded all. Scarcely had his wounded heart ceased to bleed at the death of

his good and generous friend at court, Doña Juana de la Torre, than he realized the perilous condition of another, and his best, friend, the gentle and peerless Isabella. During his absence she had raised his son, Don Diego, to the rank and emoluments of the body guard, had issued letters of naturalization to his brother Diego, who, having joined the priesthood, was now endowed with a benefice; she had written twice to Ovando to take good care of the interests of the admiral, and she had raised his faithful follower and deliverer, Diego Mendez, to the ranks of the nobility. His object in hastening home amidst storms and accidents was that he might see the queen. Now that he had come, he could not see her. It is said that she exacted from Ferdinand, on her death bed, a promise to recall Ovando, who had almost exterminated the Indians of Hispaniola, and the restoration of Columbus to his vice-regal administration; promises which he never fulfilled. What must have been his agony, when shortly after November 26, 1504, he received the tidings of the death on that day, of Isabella! From his bed of torture he penned the following instructions to his son, showing not only his love and veneration for the good and true departed queen, but also his loyalty to the perfidious king: "A memorial for thee, my dear son Diego, of what is at present to be done. The principal thing is to commend affectionately, and with great devotion, the soul of the Queen, our sovereign, to God. Her life was always Catholic and holy, and prompt to all things in His holy service; for this reason we may rest assured that she is received into His glory, beyond the cares of this rough and weary world. The next thing is to watch and labor in all matters for the service of our sovereign the king, and to endeavor to alleviate his grief. His majesty is the head of Christendom. Remember the adage that when the head suffers all the members suffer. Therefore all good Christians should pray for his health and long life; and we, who are in his employ, ought more than others to do this with all study and diligence." It is no wonder, then, that it was remarked that the transcendent services of the subject could never inspire the sovereign with gratitude, or that the greatest ingratitude of the sovereign could make the subject cease to be loyal. At this distant day we cannot comprehend the sentiments of Columbus and of Isabella towards each other. That she regarded him as a friend, a Christian of highest type, the mirror of her own virtues, a model of modesty, simplicity, artlessness, sanctity and loyalty, and admired his grandeur of character and sublimity of genius, is too well known. In her he saw a model of purity, constancy and fidelity, the grace of religion, the poetry of humanity, the soul of sympathy, the type of honor, and the human perfection of religion. The Count de Lorgues says,

that at her death, Columbus experienced a lifelessness of heart, the mute desolation of the tomb, an unutterable grief, and an intense increase of his physical sufferings.

It is not with the same results that we come now to speak of the relations of Columbus with King Ferdinand. On his arrival at Seville, he wrote to the court to announce his return and his readiness to await the royal orders, and on receipt of the letter Ferdinand spoke to the Admiral's son Diego the most flattering things of his father, but no answer was sent to the letter. A memorial accompanying the letter received no notice, though it contained important information and recommendations on the administration of Hispaniola. Twice afterwards he wrote to the king, but he received no answer. At his repeated request his son made every effort to obtain an answer, but failed of success. While Ferdinand made no reply to the letters of Columbus, the Sovereign Pontiff, of his own motion, wrote to the Admiral to request information of his discoveries in the Indies, and received in reply an elaborate report. While no notice was taken by Ferdinand of the protest of the viceroy of the Indies against the pretentious plan of himself, Ovando and Fonseca, for the erection of an Episcopal hierarchy in Hispaniola, where no Indians scarcely, either pagan or Christian, were left alive, the Holy See hearkened to the message of Columbus and to the embassy of his brother Bartholomew; and, even after the king had named the candidates for episcopal and archiepiscopal honors, and the Pope had approved from his information, it was the protest of Columbus that arrested the vain proceedings and the forwarding of the bulls. Ovando cared not for the flock, for flock there was none, provided he embellished his administration with the grandeur of the hierarchy. It was a mockery of zeal and religion. The voice of the man who had discovered America, had more power at Rome, than the united voices of Ovando, Fonseca, the Spanish ambassador, and Ferdinand, the king. In this instance Columbus exerted more power on his death bed than Ferdinand on his throne. Rome is ever just.

While the discoverer of America was thus drinking the bitter chalice of sorrow, disappointment, neglect, ingratitude and disease, and while the shadows of death were clustering around his bed of illness, another incident took place at Seville, which is replete with intense interest. Columbus received a visit from Americus Vesputius. In the July number of the *REVIEW*, I saw a brief account of the manner, in which the name of America, in honor of Americus, had been conferred upon the New World, instead of the name of Columbia, in honor of Columbus. Though Las Casas seems to have entertained a doubt as to the innocence of Ameri-



cus in this matter, it seems now to be well settled that this unfortunate misnomer of the New World was not brought about by any design or contrivance of Americus. His relations with Columbus were always friendly, and on this occasion he proffered his kind offices to the Admiral at court, to which he had been invited by King Ferdinand. Columbus had essayed in vain to obtain the slightest justice from the king; his offices and titles were either taken away or ignored, and his very income and revenues were withheld. While immense sums were due to Columbus, he was suffering the pangs of poverty and want. He was only too glad to avail himself of the kind offers of Americus at court; and gave him a letter of introduction and commendation to his son, Diego. Columbus spoke of Americus as "a very good man." It is sad, however, to relate that the intercession of Americus Vesputius at the court of Ferdinand, brought no relief to Columbus. Mr. Irving well and sympathetically describes the situation thus: "A little delay, a little more disappointment, and a little more infliction of ingratitude, and his loyal and generous heart would cease to beat; he should then be delivered from the just claims of a well-tried servant, who, in ceasing to be useful, was considered by him to have become importunate."

It was an error of the Count de Lorgues to suppose that the conduct of Americus towards Columbus was not blameless, and that their relations were not the best. On the contrary, they entertained a high regard for each other. It is quite probable, on historical data, that Americus took part in fitting out the second voyage of Columbus. They were certainly acquainted with each other in the summer of 1493, and probably sooner. Mr. Fiske says, "the relations between the two seem always to have been most cordial, and after the Admiral's death his sons seem to have continued to hold the Florentine navigator in high esteem. In the midst of our disappointment at the misnomer of our country, it is a source of honorable pride, at least, that it was not named after a selfish and intriguing intruder, but rather after a man of honor, truth, loyalty and renown. But the honor, on the contrary, was justly due to Columbus and Columbia should have been the name of the New World.

We have mentioned, as among the wrongs sustained by Columbus, that the New World he discovered was not named in his honor. We have already explained briefly how this was brought about. But it was a wrong which was not inflicted until after his death. It is a wrong to his name and fame; a posthumous injustice. It seems that the term *mundus novus*, as used in the letters of Americus applied only to Brazil, and so, too, the name of America, when first used, applied only to Brazil. The first map

on which appeared the name of America was prepared and annotated by the eminent old master in art, Leonardo da Vinci, the celebrated painter of the Last Supper, and was made about the year 1514, or eight years after the death of Columbus. It applied only to South America, or Brazil. The first map on which the name was applied to both continents was made in 1541, by Mercator, thirty-five years after the death of Columbus and twenty-nine years after the death of Americus. Mercator was born in the very year in which Americus died, 1512.

Much learned speculation has been expended on the simple question of the name of the New World. Not the least queer and far-fetched theory on the subject is that of Professor Jules Marcon, that the name, after all, was not derived from Americus Vesputius, but rather from a mountainous range in Nicaragua, which was called by the Indians *Amerrique*, or Americ, and the professor supposes that Columbus must have heard of these mountains on his fourth voyage; but he does not see that the name would have been more appropriately applied to Nicaragua. Mr. Fiske mentions what he calls an elfish coincidence that the original America received its name, Brazil, from its principal dye-wood, while the ports of Asia visited by Marco Polo and de Garner received its name of India from its principal dye-wood, that the traveller Pegolotti saw in Sumatra a kind of Brazil-wood, which was called Ameri, and still another, and better one, which was called Columbino. But the suggestions of other and subsequent names for our continent is still more singular. One of the names suggested was *Cabotia*, in honor of the discoverer of our own country, John Cabot, while others suggested *Sebastiana*, by which the honor would be given to the son, Sebastian Cabot, in preference to the father. *Alleghenia* has also been suggested, as if the Tellegwi or Cherokee Indians were entitled to the distinction, while the Iroquois were complimented by the suggestion of the name of *Ganowania* or *Hodensaunia*, or country of the Long House, a name applied to the Five Nations residing in the Valley of the Mohawk. Mr. Fiske also mentions quaintly that in the seventeenth century Pizarro, of Orellano, who disliked the name of America, not because it was an injustice to Columbus, but because it was not sufficiently aristocratic, proposed the name of Fer-Isabelica, in honor of Ferdinand and Isabella, and he then asks, "Gentle reader, how would you like to be a Fer-Isabelican?" Another Spaniard proposed to name our continents in honor of the Emperor Charles V., *Orbis Carolinus*. And late in the sixteenth century a Portuguese author of learning suggested for the New World the name of Golden India, as distinguished from Aromatic India. But all changes of name are now impossible,

for the name of America has come to stay. While Ferdinand Columbus (the son of the Admiral, and his historian), heard the name of America applied to the New World, and took no exception, because he supposed that South America or Brazil, was intended, Bishop Las Casas grew indignant that a Florentine should give his name to a new world discovered by Spain, and that it should have been called America instead of Columbia. To one of such lively sensibilities as Christopher Columbus, the bestowal of his own name upon the world which he had discovered would have been esteemed as the highest honor, and one to which he would have considered himself absolutely entitled. The consensus of opinion is certainly in favor of such a claim.

The candle of life was fast wasting away ; sickness, disease, disappointment, ingratitude and hope deferred had brought the great discoverer to the verge of death. His letters and appeals to an ungrateful sovereign remained unanswered. The sanguine spirit of Columbus suggested to him to go to court, at every hazard, and plead his cause in person. At his request, his son Diego applied to the king and obtained permission for him to travel to Valladolid, where the court was then held, on a mule, as he was unable, from weakness to ride a horse, and a municipal law interdicted the use of mules in saddle and bridle. On February 23d the permission was given, but when it came Columbus was too weak to avail himself of it. Such was his exhausted condition that he could not use his limbs, and yet he relaxed no part of the strictest observance of the austerities of Lent, and on his bed of pain and sorrow he followed with exactness the austere rule and discipline of the Franciscans. In May, the fine weather, with Dr. Bartholomew's aid, enabled him to mount his mule and commence his journey. Did the ungrateful king suggest this journey, that he might be done with him ? But he reached Segovia, greatly prostrated, where the court was held, after enduring intense sufferings and consequent delay at Salamanca.

King Ferdinand was an exceedingly polite man ; he could even venture on being gracious, and he could skilfully express his satisfaction and pleasure at seeing an old and faithful servant. While omitting to call him by his true and legal title of viceroy, or to recognize his rank, his patience at the Admiral's recital of his perilous voyage, and still more of the discovery of the rich gold mines of Veragua, was most regal. The long and detailed account of the Admiral's shipwreck at Jamaica, his abandonment by Ovando, the Governor of Hispaniola, the revolt of the Porras brothers, the treatment he had received at San Domingo, did not in the least fatigue the king. On the contrary, he gave ample and polite expression to the deep interest he felt in the



Admiral and to the gratitude of the crown for his services. But withal, the poor Admiral found that the king managed to terminate the interview while seeming to prolong it. No promise of justice or decision as to the Admiral's status was made. Columbus understood the king well; yet his sanguine temperament led him again after a few days to the palace, where he found effusive politeness, as well as royal circumspection and reserve. The Admiral was bereft of every opportunity for asking any question calling for a direct answer. But the king spoke abundantly and sympathetically of the old man's rheumatism and gout, gave wholesome advice as to the care he should take of himself, and even mentioned the medicines suitable for his disease. Yet the Admiral again found himself terminating the interview in spite of his wish to the contrary; the king had saluted him *a Dios*. Such practices would now be clever in a modern politician after the election. Let us recall the reception Columbus received at Barcelona; but that was before the election!

Columbus next addressed a letter to the king in which he plainly and directly reminded him of former promises, and expressed a preference for good deeds rather than for good wishes or fine words. The wily king now adopted the silencing course of promising anything—for how then could the Admiral doubt his word!—and he diplomatically proposed to refer the numerous and complex matters in question to arbitration. The Admiral accepted the proposal and named the new Archbishop of Seville, Don Diego de Deza, and to this the king assented; but, from some cause or other, this was the last heard of arbitration. The poor Admiral next proposed to leave the whole matter to the king himself, that thus he might avoid the delays of litigation, and from the king's bounty and justice finally receive what was due to him; then the spent servant could retire to obscurity and in peace prepare for death. The answer of the perfidious king to this appeal was the most heartless of all, for he assured the Admiral that the king could not dispense with his services, but would accord him all his dues, that Spain owed to him the Indies, and that not only should he have all that was due to him, but that the crown would recompense him most generously. With such assurances from his king the Admiral could but be silent. Further insistence would be an insult to the crown. Such was his own integrity and truth that he even now seemed to trust his most perfidious enemy. But as time wore away, and no promises were fulfilled, and no relief came, Columbus made an appeal to the Junta de Descaigos, a tribunal to watch over the execution of the royal intentions and testamentary dispositions. The Junta took the matter in hand, but its delays were insufferable, and the proceedings were paralyzed. Again at his de-

mand the investigation was resumed, but only resulted in delays. The members of the Junta were, of course, divided. To their honor be it said, that Cardinal Ximenes and the Archbishop of Seville pronounced their opinion in favor of the Admiral, and they were supported by every conscientious member of the body. But the king's hand was felt, though not seen; and around him were ranged a majority consisting of courtiers and relatives of the king, who all united in the opinion that the obligations assumed by the crown in and by the convention of April, 1492, with Columbus, could not be fulfilled, because they exceeded the value of the services rendered, and because it would be impolitic and unwise for any sovereign to make one of his subjects so powerful, especially a foreigner. But still the Junta made no decision. A majority stood on the side of injustice, but shrank from formulating it in a decision. Ferdinand's hand was seen throughout.

Columbus's poverty was so great that he was unable to maintain his stay in Segovia. Imagine the mockery of subjecting such a man to the forms, ceremonies and expenses of attendance on a punctilious court. His bodily sufferings became greatly increased by the agonies of his mind. He was forced to go to Valladolid, where it was cheaper to live. Here the court tarried a very short time. The tortures of his disease were a living death. Ferdinand coolly watched his victim,—his strength was gone, his resources were exhausted. Could the Admiral refuse a compromise in such straits as these? Availing himself of the Admiral's dire misfortunes, Ferdinand had the meanness to propose to him a release of all his privileges and the acceptance in lieu thereof of an estate or demesne in Castile, the fief of Carrian de los Condes, together with a pension from the king's treasury. At this blow the old spirit of the Admiral arose in his breast, and he rejected the unworthy offer with disdain. This proud answer of a subject to a king was given by the occupant of a narrow little room in the inn at Valladolid; and on the walls of that room were then hanging the fetters in which the discoverer of the New World had been sent back to Spain. The hard terms proposed by Ferdinand to Columbus, and worse ones, have since been wrenched from his family and successors; all his hereditary titles, offices and emoluments have since been surrendered in exchange for the barren Dukedom of Veragua. But retributive justice has kept pace with spoliation; the vast empires which Columbus gave to Spain have passed from her grasp; the island of Cuba is the only remnant of the New World his genius and generosity bestowed.

The elevated and saintly character of Columbus is shown throughout these unworthy proceedings of his king and of the whole Spanish administration. It has already been remarked that

no amount of royal ingratitude could diminish his loyalty. His chastened soul preserved silence under such wrongs; wrongs the more consuming because they were inflicted by a king upon a loyal subject. On the other hand, and in contrast with all this, the conduct of Columbus was otherwise marked by profound courtesy, consideration and sagacity. When he sent his report to Rome, he sent a copy of it to his open enemy, Fonseca. When the latter was promoted to the See of Palencia, Columbus instructed his son to make his homage to the new bishop, saying, "If the Bishop of Palencia has arrived, or when he arrives, tell him how rejoiced I am at his advancement, and if I come to the court I will stay with His Grace, will he nill he; and we must renew our former brotherly ties; and he cannot withdraw from it, for my services will make it so." And now again, when the Infanta of Spain, Queen Juana, and her husband, Archduke Philip, arrived from Flanders to take possession of the throne of Castile, which she inherited on the death of her mother, Isabella, Columbus, with an honorable regard for others, sent his faithful brother Bartholomew to Laredo to unite with King Ferdinand in receiving them, and to present to the royal daughter the homage which he had always paid to the mother. He would have gone in person but for a renewal of his cruel tortures. Bartholomew discharged his mission with manly dignity, and added the expression of a hope that the new queen might restore him to the honors and estates of which he was now so unjustly deprived. But under the new Queen of Castile the overpowering and ever-vigilant influence of Ferdinand prevented the bestowal of justice on this much-abused and greatly wronged and illustrious subject. In two years, Ferdinand succeeded to the throne of Castile on the death of Juana, as her heir.

The conduct of Ferdinand towards Columbus has met with universal condemnation. The learned publicist, Tarducci, while seeing some danger to the Spanish crown in the bestowal of immense powers and revenues upon a subject, says that "it was not by breach of faith, perjury and blackest ingratitude that he (Ferdinand) ought to have secured the safety of his crown." The Count de Lorgues details with righteous indignation, and with generous sympathy for the wronged one, the pecuniary embarrassments of Columbus bordering on absolute want, and his fruitless efforts to regain his titles, government and revenues for himself or for his son and successors; and then adds: "Ferdinand could not in fact be moved." Father Knight writes as follows: "Ferdinand was unworthy of the loyal service of Columbus, utterly unworthy of the faithful love of the saintly Isabella. In Isabella's grave lay buried the earthly hopes of her great Admiral.



From her death to his own, eighteen months later, he was working hard, for his son's sake, to obtain from the ungrateful king his money overdue and his privileges confirmed upon oath again and again. Ferdinand saw that his troublesome suit would soon be stilled in death, and so he put him off with fair words and waited for the end."

Mr. Prescott has expressed his opinion of Ferdinand's treatment of Columbus in these unmistakable terms: "But whatever reason may have operated to postpone Columbus's restoration to power, it was the grossest injustice to withhold from him the revenues secured by the original contract with the crown. According to his own statement, he was so far from receiving his share of the remittances made by Ovando, that he was obliged to borrow money, and had actually incurred a heavy debt for his necessary expenses. The truth was, that as the resources of the new countries began to develop themselves more abundantly, Ferdinand felt greater reluctance to comply with the letter of the original capitulation; he now considered the compensation as too vast and altogether disproportioned to the services of any subject; and at length was so ungenerous as to propose that the Admiral should relinquish his claims in consideration of other estates and dignities to be assigned him in Castile. It argued less knowledge of character than the king usually showed that he should have thought the man, who had broken off all negotiations on the threshold of a dubious enterprise rather than abate one tittle of his demands, would consent to such abatement when the success of that enterprise was so gloriously established." Even Justin Winsor, the librarian of Harvard, who had some reputation as an historian before he wrote his "Life of Columbus," says: "The change bringing him in the presence of his royal master only made his mortification more poignant. His personal suit to the king was quite as ineffectual as his letters had been. The sovereign was outwardly beneficent and inwardly uncompliant. The Admiral's recitals respecting his last voyage, both of promised wealth and saddened toil, made little impression. He evaded the point in his talk with bland countenance, and did nothing in his acts beyond referring the question anew to a body of counsellors convened to determine the fulfilment of the queen's will. They did nothing quite as easily as the king. Las Casas tells us that the king was only restrained by motives of outward decency from a public rejection of all the binding obligations towards the Admiral, into which he had entered jointly with the queen." Mr. Fiske writes of this sad part of the saddest of lives: "The death of the queen deprived Columbus of the only protector who could stand between him and Fonseca"; he might have added—and between him and King Ferdinand.

"The reimbursement for the wrongs which he had suffered at that man's hands" (and at Ferdinand's) was never made. The last eighteen months of the Admiral's life were spent in sickness and poverty. Accumulated hardships and disappointment had broken him down, and he died." Mr. Irving says in various places: "These petitions were treated by Ferdinand with his usual professions and evasions." . . . "The cold and calculating Ferdinand beheld this illustrious man sinking under infirmity of body, heightened by that deferred hope which 'maketh the heart sick.'" The great and good Las Casas wrote: "The more applications were made to him, the more favorably did he reply; but still he delayed, hoping to exhaust their patience." Our "*American Cyclopædia*" says: "He lay sick some months at Seville, and recovered only to have his claims finally rejected by the king, Queen Isabella being now dead. An old man, broken in body, although in full possession of his mental faculties" (Justin Winsor makes him a lunatic), "having in his own words 'no place to repair to except an inn, and often with nothing to pay for his sustenance,' the discoverer of the New World died."

Such was the persistent hatred with which Columbus was pursued, even to his grave, by enemies whom he had never injured, that he thought as a last resource he would withdraw from their sight, and altogether from public sight. His health, already desperate, received another severe blow from his wearisome journeys, as he dragged himself about in pursuit of the court and of what was quite a different thing—justice. At Valladolid he was again forced to his bed, and the reaction from his recent struggles with the king left his body and mind utterly prostrated; and hope was gone. As a peace-offering to his enemies, since his own life was spent, and the thought of his children and family pressed upon his heart, he now addressed a last and powerful appeal to the king, proposing to surrender all his rights and privileges into his hands, and only asking that his son and successor, Diego, might be appointed to the government of which he had been deprived. In his petition to the king, Columbus wrote: "It is a matter which concerns my honor. Your Majesty may do as you think proper with all the rest; give or take, as may appear for your advantage, and I shall be satisfied. I believe that the worry caused by the delay of my suit is the main cause of my ill-health." This was the last appeal which the discoverer of the New World made to Ferdinand, to whom he had given that world; and as long as these repeated appeals to his ungrateful king continued, his sanguine mind gave birth and nourishment to new hopes, and indulged in projects of new enterprises for the good of mankind and for the exaltation of religion. This last appeal met with no better result than all pre-

ceding ones. Columbus was left to die. His sad condition at this moment, which makes an appalling contrast with his triumph at Barcelona in 1493, is vividly described by Francesco Tarducci: "Meanwhile the misfortunes of Columbus were nearing their end. The momentary fire which for a brief space revived him was extinguished. The Adelantado had hardly left him (to greet the Infanta Juana) when nature asserted her claims, and age and suffering weighed heavier than before on his enfeebled body. His illness grew daily more alarming, and soon there was no doubt of the mortal result that it would soon produce. On the 19th of May the Admiral himself perceived his hour approaching, and, calm and tranquil with the faith and resignation of the righteous, he prepared for the great passage. But before he attained this calm resignation, how many thoughts must have crowded his mind in that last struggle between life and death, and all full of inexpressible grief! The long years spent in running from one place to another to beg audience of kings, ministers and grandees of the kingdom; the mockery and scorn with which he was received and repelled on every side; the struggles he underwent in support of his ideas; the fatigues and perils and distress he suffered in carrying them out; and the grandeur of his achievements and the enthusiasm he had aroused on every side. And now, after enriching Spain with so many regions and such treasures as no human tongue ever told of; after changing, by his discoveries, the face of the known world, doubling the known space of the globe, he was now groaning in abandonment and contempt in a wretched lodging-house, and compelled to beg for a loan of money to buy a cot to die on. And those who had ridiculed his undertaking were triumphing in wealth and ease, in power and honor."

Columbus calmly, bravely and reverently prepared to meet the fate awaiting him in common with all men. Affection and a sense of justice led his magnanimous soul to give a studious and deliberate attention to the disposition he should make of his temporal interests. These interests were now denied and were nothing in possession; but in right and good title they were immense, and were proportioned to, and would increase with, the gradual development of the western empire he had given to Spain. His relations with his family were of the most gentle and amiable nature. In his years of poverty and struggle he had always remembered his impoverished father, assisting him from his own scanty purse, and in the midst of every business pressure visiting and consoling him. His mother was dead. His two sons were devoted and loyal beyond example, and his brothers were models of fraternal love and service. He had previously made his will, about the



year 1497 or 1498, between his second and third voyages, in which he created an entail of his estates in his family. Fully comprehending and appreciating the grandeur and extent of his achievement, he, from the beginning, and before his terms were accepted, regarded the dignity and state which he had to maintain as Admiral, Viceroy and Governor as requiring a large revenue and princely surroundings; and withal, he munificently provided for the Columbian Crusade which was to restore the Holy Sepulchre to Christendom, for the poor members of his family, and for the poor of his native city of Genoa. His will has been justly regarded as reflecting the character and inward self of Columbus, so that a brief synopsis of its contents will serve an important purpose. After a profession of faith in the Holy Trinity, who inspired him with the idea of discovering the New World, and reciting his discovery and the stipulations by which he was to receive a tenth and an eighth parts of the revenues therefrom, he creates an entailed estate in the one-eighth in his elder son Diego and his descendants, and, on failure thereof, to his second son Fernando, then, again on failure of descendants male, to his brother Bartholomew, and finally to the nearest relative of legitimate birth bearing the name of Columbus. Females were excluded from the succession until failure of the male line. Ample provision was made for his son Fernando, and for his brothers Bartholomew and Diego, independently of their possible succession to the entail; for the poor members of his family, and a dower for poor girls in the Columbus family; a member of the family and bearing his name should be honorably maintained in Genoa, his native city. He then provides a fund for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre and City of Jerusalem for Christendom; for his heirs ever maintaining a true loyalty to the Spanish Crown; for the upholding of the prosperity and honor of the Republic of Genoa; for building a Church in honor of Mary of the Immaculate Conception in Hispaniola; and for providing theologians for the Indians and for their conversion to Christianity. Columbus wrote another will, in 1502, but it never came to light, and no doubt conformed to the will of 1497 or 1498. But now in August 25, 1505, he sent for a notary and made a codicil by which he confirmed the entail of his estates made in the will of 1497 or 1498, and its other chief provisions, and made provisions for his second wife Beatrice Enriquez. The most noticeable feature in this codicil is the change of the Admiral's language in regard to King Ferdinand; for in the former will he had greatly eulogized the generosity of the king and queen in taking up the great enterprise of his discovery; but now he states in his codicil that he "had made them a present of the Indies as a thing of his own." A remarkable feature in this

codicil is that wherein Columbus thus solemnly rejects and repudiates the territorial line established by treaty between Spain and Portugal, and adheres to the line of demarkation established by the Pope. In this he manifested a sagacity far superior to that of the wily Ferdinand; a sagacity, which, if it had been followed by Spain, would have saved to her the immense empire of Brazil. It would probably, also, have prevented the name of Americus from being given to the New World instead of that of Columbus. With great delicacy of thought and memory, after signing the codicil, he wrote in his own handwriting the names of several persons who had given him some little aid at various times; and now his son was directed to see them all paid, amongst them a poor Jew, whose name he did not remember, but whose address he gave as one living near the Jewry Gate in Lisbon.

The many unjust charges which have been made against Columbus must be classed among the instances of ingratitude he suffered, and the wrongs and misfortunes of his life and of his posthumous fame. One of the first charges in point of time and virulence was the accusation that he was selfish, grasping and avaricious. This unworthy charge is fully refuted by the will, which I have just mentioned. No man could be selfish who had thus been so generous and so just to others. No man could be grasping who had thus been so free and openhanded in disposing of his means. No man could be avaricious who showed such utter disregard for the possession or hoarding of wealth. This charge has been specially applied to the alleged exorbitancy of the terms which he insisted on in his negotiations with the Spanish sovereigns. Had these terms been exorbitant, the grasping and avaricious Ferdinand never would have conceded them. Services, like every other thing of value, have their recompense, have to be estimated by the risk run, by the great gain expected, and by the result, the competition and the actual acceptance. Had those of Columbus been overestimated by him, would the king of Portugal have sent for him to return to Portugal and receive from him the concession of the same recompense? Would the king of England have sent him a favorable message by his brother Bartholomew? Would the king of France have done the same? There is no pretext that the services eventuated at a lower value than he had placed upon them; on the contrary the empires acquired by Spain and their revenues exceeded all the calculations, and the revenues increased with every succeeding year. By ordinary standards, the compensation should have been increased, as the value of the discovery advanced. In fact King Ferdinand found that the compensation, inasmuch as it grew with the percentage of the vast increase of the importance, vastness, riches and revenues from the New World,

would become too excessive for a subject to possess or a monarch to give. It was impossible then for the compensation to become excessive on the value of the services. There was a fixed ratio between the two.

In regard to the charge that Columbus was avaricious and mercenary in his negotiations with the Spanish sovereigns, since Mr. Justin Winsor has so lately revived the charge with increased virulence, I will quote the juster and more historical view of Mr. Washington Irving, who was far more competent than Mr. Winsor to pass upon the merits of Columbus. Mr. Irving says : " It has been said that mercenary views mingled with the ambition of Columbus, and that his stipulations with the Spanish Court were selfish and avaricious. The charge is inconsiderate and unjust. He aimed at dignity and wealth in the same lofty spirit in which he sought renown ; they were to be part and parcel of his achievement, and palpable evidence of its success ; they were to arise from the territories he should discover, and be commensurate in importance, no condition could be more just. He asked nothing of the sovereigns but a command of the countries he hoped to give them, and a share of the profits to support the dignity of his commands. If there should be no country discovered, his stipulated viceroyalty would be of no avail ; and if no revenues should be produced, his labor and peril would produce no gain. If his command and revenues ultimately proved magnificent, it was from the magnificence of the regions he had attached to the Castilian crown. What monarch would not rejoice to gain such empires on such conditions ? But he did not risk merely a loss of labor, and a disappointment of ambition in the enterprise ; on his motives being questioned, he voluntarily undertook and with the assistance of his co-adjutors, actually defrayed, one-eighth of the whole charges of the first expedition." Las Casas, a contemporary and personal acquaintance and friend of Columbus, commends him for insisting on terms, which exhibited his " great constancy and loftiness of soul." Mr. John Fiske, of Cambridge, more just and intelligent than his neighbor, Mr. Justin Winsor, of Harvard, calls the latter a " querulous critic," and observes that the terms demanded were intended for no selfish purpose, but rather to enable Columbus to undertake " another grand scheme of his own," " to deliver Jerusalem from the miscreant followers of Mahomet, the enlargement of the bounds of Christendom and the achieving of triumphs of untold magnificence for its banners." How much more creditable to the historian is this large and magnanimous view, than that of Mr. Justin Winsor, who makes himself a driveller in struggling to make one of Columbus.

Among the charges against Columbus, which show the ingrati-



tude he had to bear, and the misfortunes of his exalted station, was the blended accusation that he was incompetent for command or administration, and cruel and tyrannical in his viceregal government of Hispaniola. So far from being cruel to the natives, it is well known that he was, from the beginning, their true and gentle friend, and, among a thousand instances I could cite, I will mention only two—his encountering the animosity of Pinzon, who had deserted the expedition, by liberating the Indians he had taken on his ships as slaves to be sold in Spain; his incurring the hatred of Father Boil, for defending the good and faithful cacique, Guacamagari, against the suspicions and condemnations of the Vicar-Apostolic, and taking the chief to his friendship when Father Boil would have handed him over to punishment. His alleged cruelty to Spaniards was certainly not manifested in pardoning the rebel Roldan, and taking him again into his service; nor in sharing with the Spanish rebels in his exile, on the island of Jamaica, the sparse supplies he received from Aguado, nor in taking them back to Spain at his own expense, sharing his last pittance of cash with them at Seville, and urging the payment of their dues by the government while he himself was in need, and was deprived of his revenues and property. Compared with the atrocities practised in Hispaniola, under Bobadilla and Aguado, the administration of Columbus was not only merciful, but was, in fact, most lenient. It was only when Spaniards became the meanest miscreants, or Indians threatened the existence of the Spanish rule in America, that he asserted his authority, and used his power of punishment; but even then, it was always tempered with mercy. The opinions of two historians, writing four hundred years apart, and under different circumstances—one under the Spanish monarchy, and the other under our own free government and institutions—are worthy of our acquiescence and concurrence. These opinions, on the double charge of incompetency of administration and tyrannical conduct, are well set forth in the following passage from Mr. Fiske, who gives also the opinion of Bishop Las Casas: "When Margarite and Boyle were once within reach of Fonseca, we need not wonder that mischief was soon brewing. It was unfortunate for Columbus that his work of exploration was hampered by the necessity of founding a colony and governing a parcel of unruly men let loose in the wilderness, far away from the restraints of civilized society. Such work required undivided attention and extraordinary talent for command. It does not appear that Columbus was lacking in such talent. On the contrary, both he and his brother, Bartholomew, seem to have possessed it in a high degree. But the situation was desperately bad, when the spirit of mutiny was fomented by deadly enemies at court. I do

not find adequate justification of the charges of tyranny brought against Columbus. The veracity and fairness of the history of Las Casas are beyond question; in his divinely beautiful spirit one sees now and then a trace of tenderness even for Fonseca, whose conduct towards him was always as mean and malignant as towards Columbus. One gets from Las Casas the impression that the Admiral's high temper was usually kept under firm control, and that he showed far less severity than most men would have done under similar provocation. Bartholomew was made of sterner stuff, but his whole career presents no instance of wanton cruelty; towards both white men and Indians his conduct was distinguished by clemency and moderation. Under the government of these brothers a few scoundrels were hanged at Hispaniola—many more ought to have been."

Columbus has been accused of being the first to introduce slavery into America. This is a serious charge, and should be met in the spirit of candor and truth. And at the outset we must premise, that the views and practices in relation to slavery which prevailed, or were tolerated, among Christian nations at the close of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries, are not the views and practices of Christian nations of the present day. The Catholic Church has always been the greatest of the advocates of liberty, and the most beneficent of emancipators. Slavery was tolerated when she came into existence; and while she has never lost her heaven-inspired wisdom, she has refrained from the fanatical pursuit of a great object, and has not waged war on what the civil law of the State regarded as vested rights. It is undeniable that for the eighteen hundred years of her existence she has opposed slavery, and now, at the close of the nineteenth century, her successive victories in the cause of human liberty have left her free to wage the warfare against the African slave-trade—the subjection into slavery of new slaves—and in this struggle she is the leading spirit. In an article in the number of this REVIEW for January, 1890, the present writer, in an article entitled "The New Crusade of the Nineteenth Century," has detailed the splendid labors of Cardinal Lavigerie, the great bishop of Africa, and of Pope Leo XIII., against slavery and the slave-trade. Whatever may have been the practice of nations at the period in question, they lend no countenance to slavery or to the slave-trade, or to the subjugation of human beings to slavery, for us, or for our day, or for our country. Las Casas, the great Catholic bishop and Liberator of that day, was, himself, at first a slave-owner, by gift of his father, as was also the present writer a slaveholder by inheritance in his early life. Las Casas, when a youth, received from his father the gift of one of the Indian slaves sent over

to Spain by Columbus himself from Hispaniola. He became devotedly attached to the young slave, and we can well imagine how the young Castilian, in obedience to the injunctions of the Church to masters in respect to the religious instruction of their slaves, taught the beautiful and tender precepts of religion to the Carib slave, while the latter, no doubt, hummed, in the gilded palace of Las Casas, the wild ditties he had learned in his native island when free. These were drowned in the softer and gentler notes of the *Salve Regina*, sung from the gentle heart of the young Las Casas. It was thus from the practical lessons of slavery that the illustrious Las Casas became the most eminent of liberators. When Isabella, rising above the age in which she lived and of the country over which she ruled, ordered the liberation of the Carib slaves sent to Spain from Hispaniola, Las Casas gave up his slave. And when the just queen no doubt tendered compensation to her subjects for their losses in the venture, we can see in imagination the young Castilian giving up his slave and refusing the guerdon.

History is said to revolve like a wheel, perpetually repeating its own lessons. Thus, we remember well, in our own country, in our own times, and in our own personal experience, a repetition of the scene at the palace of Las Casas in Seville, between the young Carib and his gentle master, a repetition which occurred at the capital of our own country. Hereditary slavery existed in the District of Columbia, as a former part of the State of Maryland, and, like the young Castilian, the present writer owned hereditary slaves, received from his ancestors. The institution in old Catholic Maryland was a paternal relation, and sweet, gentle and tender were the dealings of Catholic masters with their slaves. Well do we remember how it was one of the religious duties we learned with our catechism and prayers, enjoined both by parent and priest, that we should instruct the family slaves in their religious lessons, duties, and devotions, and how, in the Land of Mary, a land still blessed under the *Auspice Maria*, we taught to our hereditary bondsmen, like the young Castilian four hundred years ago at Seville, the sweet melodies of the *Ave Maria*. The edict of emancipation from Queen Isabella, in 1495, found its counterpart or supplement in the Emancipation Act of Congress when signed by President Lincoln, by which our own and all the slaves in the District of Columbia were liberated. Scarcely had the President's name been signed to the Act, when it was known in every household in Washington. We saw the chains fall from the hands of about three thousand manumitted slaves then made freemen; we saw the implements and badges of service fall from their hands and persons suddenly while in the very act of service. The government pro-



vided compensation for the losses of the masters, as, no doubt, did Queen Isabella. But, while we saw neighbors, friends and kindred receiving the proffered compensation, we refused, as did the young Las Casas, to accept the price of human liberty. No consideration could ever induce a person who had once witnessed human slavery, even under the most favorable circumstances, ever to rivet again the chains which have once been broken. It was thus, too, with Las Casas. From being a slave-owner he became the greatest of emancipators, the most powerful and earnest advocate of human liberty. So, too, has been our own experience. In the article on "The New Crusade of the Nineteenth Century," in this REVIEW, an earnest appeal was made to Americans to unite with and support the noble efforts of Cardinal Lavigerie and Pope Leo XIII. It is a remarkable fact, that the greatest emancipators have sprung from conditions of society in which slavery existed. Isabella had seen thousands of the conquered Moors from Granada, by the authority of Ferdinand and herself, sold into slavery, and yet, when she saw the Carib slaves from the New World, in 1495, she issued her emancipation edict. Las Casas, from being a slaveholder, became the first of human liberators. Washington, Jefferson, and Madison, sons of Virginia, the heart of the slave territory of this country, announced their advocacy of gradual and peaceable emancipation in the last century, and before any record we have been able to find of an abolition society in Massachusetts. A native of Virginia, where he and his parents lived in the midst of slavery, and afterwards a citizen of the slave State of Kentucky, was no less a person than Abraham Lincoln, the emancipator of American slaves. Cardinal Lavigerie, the leader of the *New Crusade of the Nineteenth Century*, is a bishop in Africa, and a resident of the Dark Continent, and we expect to show that Christopher Columbus was no advocate or friend of human slavery.

One of the first acts of Columbus in the New World, on his first voyage, was to liberate Indians from the slavery to which they had been doomed by their Spanish captors. While coasting along Hispaniola on his return from his first voyage to the New World, Columbus was rejoined by Martin Alonzo Pinzon, who had deserted the Admiral; and on discovering that Pinzon had on board his ship four Indian men and two girls whom he had violently seized on leaving the Rio de Gracia, and whom he intended to carry to Spain and sell as slaves, Columbus at once liberated them and sent them back with presents to their own homes. The enmity of Pinzon, greatly intensified by this noble interference, was the result of this emancipation. So on many other occasions he guarded the liberty of the natives. On his return from the second expedition, food became so scarce that some

of the Spanish crew and passengers in their despair proposed to kill the Indian prisoners on board the ship and to allay the pangs of their own hunger by eating their Indian fellow-passengers, while others proposed to throw the Indians overboard and thus leave fewer mouths to feed. "But the Admiral," says Tarducci, "with all the force of his will and his authority, opposed the injustice, showing them that every consideration of humanity and of religion ought to convince them what a horrid infamy it would be to give way to the thought, and encouraged them to hope for relief, for they would soon reach the end of their troubles. His words were received by all with a smile of scornful incredulousness." And yet he succeeded in saving the Indians from such a fate as they might have expected from cannibals rather than Christians.

The peaceful Indians of Hispaniola had long been subjected to raids from their Carib and cannibal neighbors, who, besides murdering them, carried many of their men and women into slavery. Columbus defended his Indian subjects, at their earnest request, from these destructive and enslaving attacks, and in these wars with the Caribs, many prisoners were taken in arms and in the heat of battle. The first proposition of Columbus was to send these prisoners of war to Spain to be sold as slaves for account of the government, and with the view that they might be taught Spanish and the Christian religion, and afterwards return to the New World to serve as interpreters, instructors and missionaries amongst the Indians. This suggestion of Columbus had for its object the protection of the peaceful Indians of Hispaniola from the cannibals, and the reformation of the criminals themselves by what the Jesuit Father Knight calls "a little penal servitude." Well has it been said that this was a mild measure compared with that of King Ferdinand in sending into slavery so many thousands of brave and unoffending Moors, for the sole offence of defending their homes and their country. Were the cannibals to be left free to enslave others rather than be themselves subjected to a servitude so well calculated to improve their condition? Had the question been confined to these murderous and enslaving cannibals, there would be less embarrassment; but it turned out in the course of the Spanish régime in the New World, that the Spaniards had to put down Indian rebellions by the sword, and wars with the Indians were of no rare occurrence. Prisoners of war were frequently taken with arms in their hands, and it became a grave question how to dispose of them. Tarducci states that the theologians of that day and of that country had decided that prisoners of war, taken with arms in their hands, might be treated in the way that Columbus had suggested. Ferdinand and Isabella, his own sovereigns, and in

whose service he was now acting, had, under his own eyes, at the fall of Malaga, permitted, if not ordered, eleven thousand individuals, of both sexes, whose gallant defence of their country should have inspired respect if not admiration in their conquerors, to be dragged from their families, separated from each other, and sold into slavery. It should also be considered that Columbus was not acting in his own interest but in that of his sovereigns. It was a significant fact that he was all the time under great pressure from the crown for revenue and income from the New World. On his return to Hispaniola on this third expedition, disappointments of the keenest kind awaited him; the hopes he had entertained and reported to the crown of vast expected riches and revenues were shattered; and he was compelled to send back a part of his fleet with little of value instead of the rich cargoes of gold expected by the sovereigns. The king was all the time pressing him for remittances of gold, and his enemies at court, Margarite, Boil and Fonseca, were taunting him with the poor returns sent from his expeditions and accusing him of fraud and deception in his reports to the crown. Instead of sending rich cargoes of gold, he was compelled to urge the crown to send out further supplies of everything necessary for the new, struggling and endangered colony. It was under such circumstances that Columbus sent to Spain the Indian prisoners of war taken with arms in their hands. Isabella submitted the question of enslaving these poor creatures to the judgment of learned and pious theologians; and such was the divergency of opinions amongst them, that the queen's generosity solved the knotty question by decreeing the freedom of the Indians. It is not at all probable, or even possible, that Las Casas, the great and uncompromising friend and liberator of the Indians, would have looked leniently or apologetically on this action of Columbus if there had not been many and strong extenuating circumstances. This good and just friend and advocate of human liberty saw readily how Columbus could have fallen into such an error of judgment, for he said, "If those learned and pious persons, whom the sovereigns had chosen as guides, were so blind to the injustice of the practice, we must not wonder that the Admiral, who had not studied as much as they, fell into the error." Mr. Irving, in relating the fact of sending Indians to Spain as slaves by Columbus, says: "In so doing he sinned against the natural goodness of his character and against the feelings which he had originally entertained and expressed towards this gentle and hospitable people; but he was goaded on by the mercenary impatience of the crown and by the sneers of his enemies at the unprofitable result of his enterprises. It is but justice to his character to observe that the enslavement of the Indians thus



taken in battle was at first openly countenanced by the crown, and that when the question of right came to be discussed at the entreaty of the queen, several of the most distinguished jurists and theologians advocated the practice; so the question was finally settled in favor of the Indians solely by the humanity of Isabella." Tarducci, while not approving of this course, says: "But it is not by the standard of our own times that we must judge this deed, for that would unfairly aggravate the fault of Christopher Columbus; we should regard the ideas and customs of his age, when the trade in human flesh shocked nobody; and it was the general opinion that the Christian was the absolute master of the property and life of the infidel. The selling of human beings had long been carried on by the Spaniards and Portuguese in their possessions in Africa, where the slave trade was a great source of profit. And without going out of Europe, in Spain itself, in the presence of the sovereigns and persons of eminent dignity and learning, both secular and ecclesiastic, Columbus had seen repeated instances of how infidels were treated. During the war against the Moors, it was always the practice to make sudden raids into their land and to carry off human creatures as well as beasts, and not only warriors taken with arms in their hands, but quiet peasants, simple villagers, helpless women and children, who were dragged to the markets of Seville and other large cities, and there sold as slaves. The taking of Malaga had presented a memorable instance. To punish a long and noble resistance which their enemies ought to have admired, eleven thousand individuals of both sexes, of every condition and age, were suddenly dragged from their houses, separated from each other, and reduced to the vilest slavery, after the half of the ransom had been paid." Father Knight, in his "Life of Columbus," speaking of the blame which Mr. Irving and others cast upon Columbus for an act which he performed in keeping with the practices of the age and country, says: "This is unjust to Columbus. Irving omits an important extenuating circumstance. The Indians sent by Columbus to Spain were not, like the unhappy negroes in the detestable traffic which began later, torn from their homes and peaceful employments without a shadow of provocation, but they were prisoners who had been taken with arms in their hands in the first battles with the cacique, Guacanagari, who had caused many Spaniards to be put to death. They were prisoners of war, and in some sense their liberty was forfeit. Even in our own days prisoners of war have been detained like malefactors in close confinement for a considerable time. It would be wrong to palliate the slave trade in any form, but it must be admitted that the action of Columbus in this matter differs not only in degree but in kind from the odious cruelty of the African slave-dealers. The truth

is, that taking into account the current ideas of his time, he far more deserves praise for protecting the inoffensive than blame for being willing to enslave the hostile Indians of Hispaniola, or the barbarous Caribs of Guadalupe."

The event of all this was to win and immortalize three illustrious champions of human liberty. Isabella, who had seen thousands of the conquered Moors sent into slavery, decreed the liberty of the Indians. Las Casas, who had been a slave-holder by gift of his father, now became the great emancipator and champion of the Indians. Columbus, who had commenced his career in the New World by liberating the four Indian men and two girls whom Pinzon had seized for the purpose of sending them to Spain to be sold as slaves, and who for a brief period in obedience to the opinions and practices of the age and the urgency of the crown for profits had sent some Indians to Spain as slaves, having always been a friend of the Indians, now on the first intimation of support from the king and queen in favor of desisting from enslaving and of liberating them, returned and ever afterwards adhered to his first and original principles in favor of human liberty and the application of these principles to the Indians.

After the long and life-wearing struggle of Columbus with his ungrateful king, his rising from the bed of sickness, his painful journey on a mule to the court, his following up his suit at court from city to city, the polite deceptions he encountered, the delays, denials, and refusals of justice, such as we have herein described—after the making of his last will and testament, a true mirror and witness of his exalted sentiments and purposes; after all earthly hope of human or royal justice had been smothered in his loyal and trusting heart, the great Admiral, finding his work was done, and seeing with the eyes of faith and hope the crown of heavenly reward awaiting him in another and a better kingdom, in a world both ancient and ever new, a better world for him to make his gallant voyage to—he retired to his lowly inn, his humble cot, to his impoverished little room—to die. The humility of his last surroundings contrasted strangely with the viceregal grandeur, the palaces, the retinues and attendants, the homage of the world, the worship of sovereigns, princes and courtiers, which were all due to the discoverer of a New World, and his by solemn compact, and his to transmit by a good title to his descendants. It is easy to imagine what an humble inn was at that time in Spain, a mere lodging house, destitute of every comfort, cold, untidy, dreary and repulsive. And who cannot in imagination recall that plain little room, destitute of every ornament except the crucifix which the illustrious patient ever pressed to his bosom and his lips? But in recalling the image of that little room, gentle reader, omit not to

see hanging upon its bare walls the very chains in which the most noble of prisoners had been sent back to Spain from the world he had given her. No Roman conqueror could look upon the civic and mural crowns, the rewards of questionable triumphs over vanquished nations, with greater exultation than Columbus felt in contemplating the chains he bore, the only reward he received in return for discovered worlds. In the midst of intensest sufferings, his mind was as clear, his perceptions as lucid, his memory as unerring, and his firmness as unshaken, as when he stood upon his ship on the morning of October 12, 1492, about to land on the island of San Salvador. The soul of Columbus was flooded with torrents of celestial graces. He robed himself with the humble but inspiring habit of the third order of St. Francis, which he had worn so often before in moments of prosperity and adversity. It enveloped his noble but emaciated frame like a mantle of heavenly virtues. It was the same religious mantle which his own beloved queen, Isabella of Castile, had worn when she rendered her pure soul to God. Palace and cabin now are one and alike in the supreme moment of death. Franciscan Fathers attended the expiring Christian, whose every prayer and office of religion found deep response in the soul and voice of the great Admiral. His two devoted sons, Diego and Fernando, some of his officers who were loyal to the last to their chief, the illustrious viceroy of the Indies and Admiral of the ocean seas, and a few loving friends, and these were then few indeed, ministered to the illustrious sufferer, whose bodily pains were forgotten in the ecstatic hopes and visions of Heaven. No thought of earth, of his wrongs, of his indignities, of his injustices, of his ingratitude, weighed upon his devout soul. Not wishing to leave to his sons those chains, hanging upon the wall at this extreme moment still, as a legacy of hatred and revenge, and lest they might enkindle a bitter feeling of resentment in their hearts against an unjust king, Columbus ordered his chains to be removed from human sight and buried with him. They were his only trophies. Thus his every aspiration and thought was inspired by the grandeur of his whole character, or by the overwhelming tides of grace he then received. While his soul was sighing for the beatific vision, his robust constitution, in the order of nature, made a robust resistance against dissolution. It was a last tribute which earth paid to one of the most gallant and strongest men ever sprung from its bosom. Columbus contemplated with calm resignation the approaches of death. He addressed an edifying exhortation to his attendants. The strong man, who had forgiven all, and who had much to forgive, humbly asked for the Sacrament of Penance once more. Constantly raising his voice and his soul to God, he asked that the



favor and blessing of the Viaticum might be his, and he received again the Saviour, in whose honor he had named the first land he had discovered and landed upon in the New World. He received the Blessed Sacrament, as only apostles and martyrs receive their Saviour. It was Ascension Day, May 30, 1506. The Admiral of the Ocean Seas, the sailor of many voyages, the discoverer of many lands, seemed sailing now in a spiritual sea of seraphic graces. It was thus that after he had received the Sacraments of Penance and Holy Eucharist, he again emerged from his ecstatic contemplation of that other and better world, and asked for the Sacrament of extreme unction. His last voyage seemed near its end; the great mariner seemed about to enter the port of his supreme hopes. He knew his hour, his very moment, had arrived; and now raising his voice, that voice which had first of men sounded the praises of the true God on the Western Ocean and in the New World, he pronounced his last words, words so worthy of Christopher Columbus, *IN MANUS TUAS, DOMINE, COMMENDO SPIRITUM MEUM.*

It was a Franciscan who had given Columbus bread and water at Rabida; it was the Franciscans of Valladolid who gave him the body and blood of his Saviour; it was the Franciscans who buried his mortal remains in their own monastery at Valladolid. The local annals of that city, which, according to Harris, gave almost every insignificant event of the town from 1333 to 1539, day by day, did not even mention his death; so little heed was taken of the man whose memory now, after four hundred years, is honored by the nations of the world as no other man's memory has been honored. Seven years afterwards King Ferdinand caused his remains to be transferred to Seville, in 1513, where they were interred in the Monastery of La Cuevas of the Carthusians, where afterwards, in 1526, the remains of his elder son and successor and second admiral and viceroy were buried. On the removal of the Admiral's remains, in 1513, to Seville, King Ferdinand bestowed upon Columbus the posthumous honor of a grand funeral. Tradition assigns to the hand of the king the composition of the famous inscription, which was carved on the monument erected in his honor at Valladolid, and which is now generally accepted as the epitaph of Columbus:

À CASTILLA Y A LEON  
NUEVO MUNDO DIO COLON.

*To Castile and Leon Columbus gave a New World.*

But modern historical criticism has found reasons for doubting even these posthumous honors to the memory of Columbus. Mr.

Fiske says these traditions crumble under the touch of historical criticism. But it is certain he was buried at Valladolid in 1506, and that his remains were removed to Seville in 1513. The uncertainty of details is cited as a further proof of the obscurity in which Columbus was permitted to die. The house in which he died was No. 7 Calle de Colon, which is still shown to visitors at Valladolid, just as the supposed house in which he was said to have been born is shown to travellers at Genoa. Subsequently, as is supposed to have been done in deference to the expressed wish of the Admiral, his remains were removed from Seville and interred in the Cathedral of San Domingo. The date of this removal to San Domingo has been variously given as 1537, 1540, and 1541. The fact of their removal and interment at San Domingo is unquestioned. In 1795, by the Treaty of Basle, Spain ceded that end of the island known as San Domingo to France; and then the Spanish government, acting in concert with the Duke of Veragua, the representative of the family of Columbus, and with the consent of France, determined to remove the remains to Spanish soil and to the Island of Cuba. This removal was performed with great pomp and ceremony, and national honors were thus paid to the memory of Columbus. While Columbus made four great voyages across the ocean in his lifetime, it would seem from these accounts that his mortal remains have made the same number of journeys or voyages since his death: first to the Franciscan Convent at Valladolid; thence to the Carthusian Convent at Seville; thence to the Cathedral at San Domingo; and thence and finally to the Cathedral at Havana.

But in 1877 the startling announcement was made from San Domingo that by mistake the remains of the Admiral's son Diego, and not those of the Admiral himself, were removed from San Domingo to Havana in 1795, and they announced that on opening the vaults under the Cathedral of San Domingo in 1877, the remains of Columbus were discovered to be still reposing in the latter place. This statement is denied by the Academy of History at Madrid. Under these circumstances the present resting-place of the Admiral's remains is involved in doubt, as was the place of his birth before this honor was adjudged to Genoa. The controversy over the present resting-place of Columbus has been carried on with great earnestness and zeal by the respective advocates of San Domingo and of Havana, as the respective claimants of the honor. The Cathedral of San Domingo was completed in 1541, and it is supposed that the actual interment of the Admiral's remains at San Domingo was accomplished at that time or not long afterwards. It is alleged that no record of the inter-

ment was made at the time, nor was any record extant showing the exact spot where the remains were interred. The remains of the Admiral's son Diego, and of his brother Bartholomew, his companions in life, were also removed with his from Spain to San Domingo. The importance of an exact record designating the spot in which each of these different remains were interred was not appreciated at the time. There is an entry in the cathedral records of San Domingo that the remains of the great Admiral were interred on the right of the grand altar; but this record is claimed not to have been made until 1676, nor does it seem to be known who wrote this entry in the official record. Some interest now began to attach to the importance of preserving some record and other evidence on the subject, for in 1683, seven years after the record was made to speak on the subject, it was deemed important to secure statements from "the oldest inhabitants" of San Domingo to support and confirm the entry made in 1676. Repairs in the Cathedral of San Domingo were made from time to time, and about the year 1776, when some repairs were being made under the altar and sanctuary, a stone vault, which was believed to be the one containing the Admiral's remains, was found on the gospel side of the altar, while another vault was found on the epistle side, which was supposed to contain the remains of Bartholomew Columbus. But where were the remains of Don Diego Columbus, the second admiral, and of Don Luis Columbus, the third admiral? But in 1795, when the Admiral's remains were removed by the Spanish government to Havana, it was believed there was no question as to the identity of the proper vault, and no one then publicly doubted the removal of the remains of Columbus to Havana, although the report has always had currency at San Domingo that the remains removed to Havana in 1795 were not those of Columbus, but were the remains of one of his sons. In 1877, when the announcement was telegraphed abroad from San Domingo that while excavating near the high altar of the cathedral the casket and bones of Christopher Columbus were found still reposing there, it created great excitement, and led to a bitter controversy which has not yet been authoritatively settled. The removal to Havana was regarded on one hand as too notable an event, and one commenced and conducted with too much notoriety, and care to have failed of its object. The imposing ceremony took place on December 20, 1795, and the disinterment of the Admiral's remains took place in the cathedral in the presence of the governor, the clergy and a large concourse of the people. Solemn obsequies were celebrated with great pomp and ceremony, and the sacred remains were reverently carried from their resting-place to the sea and received on a Spanish vessel



especially suited and prepared for the purpose. The remains were thus respectfully transported to Havana, where again the governor, the clergy and the assembled people joined in the solemn repetition of the funeral services, and the relics of Christopher Columbus were deposited in the Cathedral of Havana, on Spanish soil. It was too notable an event, it has been alleged, to have been done without due and ample recognition and identification. But, on the other hand, in 1877, when the authorities of the San Domingo Cathedral announced their discovery and recognition of the remains of the Admiral still resting there, a solemn and authentic recognition of them was made in the presence of all the ecclesiastical, military and civil authorities of San Domingo, and the crowd of people assembled from far and near to see and honor the remains of Columbus was immense. This, too, was a notable event. In support of this view it is alleged that not only had the remains of Christopher Columbus been deposited under the altar of the San Domingo Cathedral, but also those of Don Diego Columbus, his son and first successor, those of his grandson, Don Luis Columbus, and those of his brother Bartholomew. In the repeated repairs done to the chapel and sanctuary, the grand altar several times changed its place, and the various caskets were thus liable to be mistaken one for another. The Most Rev. Rocco Cocchia, Bishop of Oropesa and Apostolic Delegate to San Domingo, was the official who made the repairs in 1877, and who discovered there the remains of the Admiral; and as the fact was so earnestly disputed, he continued the investigations, clearly fixed the dates, and on searching for the remains of Don Diego and of Don Luis only one of them was found, and this was inscribed with the name of Don Luis, thus clearly showing that it was the remains of Don Diego Columbus which were removed to Havana in 1795. These facts have been disputed by the Academy of History at Madrid, by whom it is alleged that those features of the inscription on the leaden box found in 1877, which were claimed to prove it to be the casket containing the remains of the first Admiral, were fraudulently added or altered. Much has been said, written and published on the subject, and while those more immediately interested in the question claim the precious deposit, each for its own soil and country, impartial general historians take opposing sides, thus leaving the controversy undecided.

Since his death, and especially in recent times, many splendid monuments have been erected to the memory of Christopher Columbus, and many more in numbers, and much grander and enduring, are now being erected or will soon be commenced.

The posthumous honors now rendered to the memory of Christopher Columbus have never been equalled in any other instance

in the history of the world and of its heroes. King Ferdinand is said to have been, as he should have been, the first to erect a statue to Columbus, reference being here made to the monument he is supposed to have erected at Seville at the time of the removal of the admiral's remains from Valladolid to Seville in 1509 or 1513, and on which was inscribed the royal epitaph already quoted as written by the hand of the king; but the existence of such a monument is now greatly doubted, while in the Carthusian church of Seville there is a slab on which is inscribed that famous distich. Most of the statues erected in honor of Columbus have been built within very recent years, and now the number of statues about to be so erected will probably exceed all previous ones. It is a singular and interesting fact that the first monument we have been able to trace out as having been erected in honor of Columbus was raised and now stands in the city of Baltimore, thus giving Baltimore another claim to the title of Monumental City. It is now still a more interesting fact that this monument was erected on October 12, 1792, the tri-centennial of the discovery of America. It was erected by Charles Francis Adrian le Paulmier Chevalier d'Amour, who came to this country with the Count de Grasse, and settled in Baltimore after the fall of Yorktown, on his country estate, and there on an elevated plateau erected this monument to Columbus, of bricks brought from England and covered with mortar or cement. The estate afterwards had several successive owners, and among them was David Barnum, in 1833, the famous hosteler of Baltimore, from whom old Barnum's Hotel was named. The land now belongs to the Samuel Ready Orphan Asylum for Girls. This interesting monument stands over fifty feet high among the branches of a centennial oak tree, and is near North and Harford avenues, Baltimore. Genoa, his native city, has two statues of Columbus, one of which is a bust on a pedestal, and was erected in 1821; the other is a much larger and finer monument and was finished in 1862. In the plaza at San Domingo, to the west of the cathedral, stands a fine bronze statue of Columbus, of heroic size, and standing on a granite pedestal about fourteen feet high. Mid-way on the pedestal is the graceful figure of an Indian girl, apparently in the act of climbing up the pedestal, and with her right hand extended and uplifted, writing on the slab the same inscription, in fac-simile, which is found on the inside of the lid of the casket of Columbus at San Domingo. This beautiful figure is said to represent the famous Indian queen, Anacaona, "the Golden Flower," Queen of Zaragua, a faithful friend of the white men, and who by treachery, after the fall and return of Columbus to Spain, met a fate at once cruel beyond description and disgraceful to our civilization. Her pathetic history is preserved in all the biographies

of Columbus. The date of this impressive monument we have not ascertained. In Lima is a grand and colossal statue of the admiral, erected in 1850. In Nassau, New Providence, is a statue, the Admiral in marble holding an iron sword. So also in the public square at Cardenas, Cuba, is a fine statue, and in Madrid another has recently been completed. On the left of the grand portico of the Capitol at Washington is a bold marble statue of Columbus advancing with majestic step and holding a small globe in his hand, while an Indian woman is standing at his side. In a recent visit which we paid to Sacramento, the capital of California, we saw with delight a beautiful group in marble; Queen Isabella is in the act of offering her jewels for the discovery of the New World. Columbus is standing on her right, triumphant over all obstacles, and admiring her magnanimity. Santangel, the treasurer of Aragon, who raised the needed money from the treasury and saved the jewels, is standing expressively and characteristically on the left. There are, no doubt, many other statues and monuments of our hero, already erected, which are not generally known, and still many more now in course of erection or about to be undertaken. Most prominent among the latter will be the colossal statue of Columbus which will soon be erected in Central Park, New York City, by the contributions of the Italian residents and citizens of the United States. The figure will be thirteen feet high, and the shaft and pedestal sixty-two feet high, and with the heavy stone foundation the head of the figure will be eighty-four feet from the ground. The statue and pedestal will all be of marble, and all will be made in Italy. At the foot of the circular marble shaft will stand four figures: one representing a Spaniard, another an American, a third an Italian, and the fourth a winged spirit. Several designs were presented for acceptance, and all were referred to a jury of eminent artists and sculptors, such as Monteverdi, Farrari, Salvini, Calderini and Maccari, and by their verdict the design of Gaetano Russo was selected, and this talented and distinguished sculptor is now engaged on the work in Italy and will come to America to superintend its erection. Indeed, the vessel bearing the statue and artist is on its way. The artist gives his services to this patriotic work gratuitously; the actual outlay will be about thirty-five thousand dollars, and it is estimated that if Russo were to accept compensation, the entire cost of the statue would amount to one hundred thousand dollars.

There are many historical paintings of the discovery of America, the most prominent one in this country being the large panel picture of that subject in the rotunda of the Capitol at Washington, in which the figure of the Admiral is grand and majestic. There is also a splendid bronze door in the Capitol representing in bas-



reliefs the principal scenes in the life of Columbus. In the Catholic University of Notre Dame, Indiana, is a series of fresco paintings by Gregori, representing also scenes in the life of Columbus. The great discoverer is the leading figure in many noble works of art throughout the world. No events in the history of mankind form such apt and worthy subjects for the skill of the painter, sculptor and engraver.

It is to be regretted that the world does not possess a single thoroughly authenticated portrait of Columbus. There are many portraits with various claims of originality, but they would scarcely be taken for likenesses of the same person. The likeness of Columbus has been minutely drawn in words, as we have already given it in a previous article, and from this description of his personal appearance we might suppose that an artist could paint his portrait. We also mentioned, in the July number of this REVIEW, that in the legendary pictures of St. Christopher, represented as a giant saint carrying the infant Christ upon his shoulders across mighty waters, Christopher Columbus was thus typified by his patron saint, and that in one of the first maps or charts of the New World, perhaps the very first, that made by a great geographer and contemporary of Columbus, Juan de la Casa, in a little vignette at a corner of the map or chart the features of the great discoverer were substituted for those of the saint, and so exact was the likeness that the author of the map considered them sufficient and omitted the name of Columbus from the map. If this map and likeness of Columbus could be obtained, it would seem to have the credit at least of having been made in his life-time. Mr. W. E. Curtis, an official of the Columbian World's Fair at Chicago, and the one specially charged with procuring a portrait of Columbus, has stated lately that this miniature is preserved in the marine archives of Spain. The map and vignette are painted on a cow-hide, as was then quite frequently done, and as La Casa was a pilot of the Admiral, he may be credited with a good knowledge of his features; but how far even the pilot of Columbus could claim sufficient artistic skill to reproduce them, and especially the expression, tints of the complexion and of the eyes, or how far, even if gifted with artistic skill, he could do what few artists can do, produce a correct likeness from memory, we are not informed. Mr. Curtis has declared his purpose of endeavoring to procure for the Columbian Exposition, if possible, this precious souvenir of the Admiral.

There is another portrait for which authenticity and originality are claimed; it is the portrait of the Admiral in De Bry's "*Voyages*," and of which the author gives the following account: "As Columbus was a man of intelligence and endowed with great ge-

nius and spirit, the king and queen of Castile, before his departure, directed his portrait to be painted by a skilful artist, that they might have a memorial of him in case he should not return from his expedition. Of this portrait I have had the good fortune to obtain a copy, since finishing the fourth volume of this work, from a friend who had received it from the artist himself; and it has been my desire, kind reader, to have this pleasure with you, for which purpose I have caused it to be engraved in reduced form, on copper, by my son, with as much care as possible, and now offer it for your inspection in this book; and, in truth, the portrait of one possessing such excellence deserves to be seen by all good men; for he was upright and courteous, pure and noble-minded, and an earnest friend of peace and justice."

Mr. Irving used several different portraits in the several editions of his "Life of Columbus." In his earlier edition, he used the portrait of the Admiral painted by Anthony Moore, of Utrecht, a favorite of Philip II., having selected it after two years' search for the best portrait. But in the Hudson edition of Mr. Irving's works quite another portrait is used, and there is little resemblance between the two. But in the National and Author's revised edition, he uses De Bry's portrait, and gives it the preference over the others without vouching for its authenticity, saying, it "is evidently the most characteristic and the most likely to be the true one." This portrait is said to be similar to the one ascribed to Bartolomeo Guardo, and possessed by Dr. Alessandro di Orchi, of Como, and said to have formerly belonged to the historian Paolo Giovio, of Como, bishop of Nocera (1483-1552), who knew Columbus and visited him several times during his stay in Rome. It is also alleged that Giovio only received into his gallery works of the greatest masters and of the highest merit, such as Titian, Bronzino, Sebastiano del Piombo, and others of like celebrity. It is a tradition that Titian painted a portrait of Columbus about thirty or forty years after the Admiral's death. Could the di Orchi portrait have been painted by Titian? Besides Titian, the portrait of Columbus was, about the same time after his death, painted by other eminent masters. This portrait is said to represent Columbus as bearing a strong resemblance to General Washington.

The original portrait of Columbus, said to have been painted by Chevalier Antonus Moor van Dashorst, 1519-1575, already mentioned above as used by Mr. Irving in his earlier editions of the "Life of Columbus," is now said to be in this country. It was lately purchased by Mr. Charles F. Gunther, a wealthy confectioner of Chicago, and intended to form one of the attractions of the approaching Columbian Exposition. This portrait is supposed to have been painted in 1570, from two miniatures owned by Mar-

garet of Parma, regent under Philip II. of the Netherlands, natural daughter of Charles V. and Margaret Van Gest, wife, in turn, of Alessandro de Medicis, duke of Florence, and Octavio Farnèse, duke of Parma and Piäcenza, and mother of the celebrated Alessandro Farnèse. Mr. Curtis, of the Columbian World's Fair, does not allow full credit to this portrait, nor to seventeen others which he himself possesses. Should he become the possessor of the features of Christopher Columbus painted on the body of St. Christopher, in the map or chart of La Casa, as he proposes to do, no doubt attempted discredit will be thrown upon that also by the owner of some rival production.

Mention has already been made of the Duke of Veragua. Luis, the grandson of Columbus, and third Admiral, exchanged the hereditary dignities and titles of the Columbus family for the dukedom of Veragua and a pension. His daughter married her cousin, Diego Columbus, and, having died without issue, the male line of the Admiral became extinct. In 1608, the title and property were merged, by marriage through the female line, in a younger branch of the royal house of Bragança, and are now represented by the present Duke of Veragua, who is said to bear a family resemblance to the Great Discoverer. The Duke takes a lively interest in the approaching Columbian celebrations in America and Spain. It is not improbable that he may come to America to join in our festivities. The ducal mansion is full of manuscripts and other memorials of his illustrious ancestor. He considers the portrait of Columbus in the National Library at Madrid, and recently restored and engraved by the Royal Historical Society, the most authentic; and the best statue is that surmounting the Madrid monument. There are many spots in Europe now hallowed by the posthumous glories of Columbus. In the splendid Cathedral of Burgos, to whose sacred shrine Columbus, on his return from his second voyage in 1496, accompanied by, and kneeling beside, Ferdinand and Isabella, joined in chanting the *Te Deum*, there is a magnificent altar, which is decorated with gold brought by him from America at that time, and so applied by order of the queen. In Valladolid is the grand audience chamber in the palace, where Isabella received the Admiral; and in the narrow street, Calle Ancha de la Magdalena, stands the humble inn or house, Number 2, over whose portal is the inscription, "Here died Columbus." There, too, is the Convent of St. Francis, in which his remains were first interred. In the Museum here, are memorials of Columbus, as well as of Cabot, Vespucci, and Verrazana, participators with him in American discoveries. At Salamanca is the great university where the proposals of Columbus were explained, discussed, and rejected, and—an interesting fact it is—here, too, the system



of Copernicus was expounded. In the National Library at Madrid are seen an original letter addressed by him to Ferdinand and Isabella and an unsigned MS. in his hand-writing. Also, the fine portrait by an Italian artist which the Duke of Veragua regards as the best, and of which there are three excellent copies in this country—one in the Geographical Society's collection in New York city; one in the Colby University of Maine; and the third in the collection of the Historical Society of Wisconsin. In the Marine Hospital at Madrid, is a fine model of Columbus's first flagship, the *Santa Maria*, and in the Royal Armory, a complete set of armor worn by him. In the Senate chamber is a splendid painting representing Columbus explaining his theories to a body of incredulous *savans*; and in the National Gallery is a fine picture of his triumphal reception at Barcelona; and in the Senate Chamber is a noble marble statue of the Admiral by Samartin, representing him as he saw the torch on shore on the night of October 11, 1492. In the Library of the King of Spain is a splendidly illuminated missal, with an inscription in gold stating that Ferdinand and Isabella had ornamented this great book with the first fruits of the Indies. Besides the papers, portraits and other memorials in the residence of the Duke of Veragua, another Spanish nobleman has a sword worn by Columbus, and a small gold box or jewel-case given by him to his son Diego. The Duke of Ossuna has an authentic manuscript copy of his diary; and a Spanish *hidalgo* has a massive gold ring which was worn by Columbus. In the Cathedral of Toledo is a gigantic St. Christopher, painted in fresco, in honor of Columbus; and the cathedral possesses a grand library, in which, however, a beautiful copy of the "*Epistola Christofori Colon*" is valued more than any other of the 40,000 volumes. At Cordova is visited the celebrated mosque wherein Columbus is said to have first seen Isabella—this being the second place in which he is said to have seen her first—and afterwards saw Cardinal Ximenes; and in the cathedral grounds he is said to have first seen the beautiful Andalusian lady, Beatrix Enriquez, who became his second wife, and the mother of his son Fernando. Her portrait is preserved in Seville; and at Cordova is shown the house of Columbus and Beatrix, in which Fernando was born. The cities of Seville, San Sebastian, Salamanca, Burgos, Valladolid, and Madrid, have streets named in his honor, and New York city has recently changed its common-place Ninth Avenue into the more fashionable Columbus Avenue.

In Seville is a residence of Columbus and the famous Columbus Library of 33,000 volumes, founded by his son Fernando, who was his father's historian; in this library are preserved many precious books of the Admiral. In the splendid Cathedral of Seville is the

tomb of Fernando Columbus, with the inscription, "To Castile and Leon, Columbus gave a New World," pictures of the ships which carried the Admiral's first expedition, and a large cross made of the first gold Columbus brought from America, and in the ex-queen's Moorish palace is an admirably carved group representing the Admiral kneeling in prayer before his first departure from Palos. In the India House at Seville are preserved manuscripts and portraits of Columbus, Cortez and Pizarro; and in that city is seen an ancient elaborately carved writing desk, once the property of Columbus. In Granada is shown the battle-flag under which Columbus fought during the siege of Malaga and elsewhere in the Moorish wars; there too is the tomb of Isabella, and the casket in which the queen is said to have collected funds to defray the expenses of Columbus's expedition, and inscribed, "Queen Isabella's Columbus casket." In the Alhambra is preserved the golden crown of Isabella made of the gold which the Admiral brought home, and here is seen the jewelled sceptre of Ferdinand. It was from this famous Moorish palace that Isabella despatched Columbus to discover the New World, and here too he was received by the sovereigns after his return in chains; and here are shown the suite of small apartments in which Washington Irving wrote his "Life of Columbus," at the famous sherry wine market, Jerez, where is still made the famous brand of sherry known as "The bones of Columbus." Not only is Cadiz reverently visited as the port from which the second expedition sailed, but also Palos, where members of the Pinzon and other families containing descendants of Columbus's companies, are still persons of historical note; but here too in Palos is seen the ancient monastery of La Rabida, and the great stone at the foot of which Columbus knelt with his son Diego to invoke the blessing of Heaven on his first expedition. In Italy are many venerated relics of Columbus. At Cogoletto is pointed out the house which is claimed to be the one in which he was born; in Genoa is shown the place where stood the residence of his father, Domenico Colombo. Besides the great Genoese monument of Columbus, near it stands a handsome public building, whose façade bears the inscription "Christopher Columbus, Genoese, discovered America." In the *Municipio*, or council hall, are preserved many autograph letters of Columbus, also a grand bust of him, of heroic size, the gift of Venice to Genoa, and a large mosaic portrait of Columbus, by the side of a similar one of Marco Polo. In the Centureoni Palace is a valuable portrait of the Admiral, similar to that in the National Library of Spain, and in another private palace is a beautiful bronze statue of the great Discoverer, executed in 1851. At Pisa Columbus had the honor of being carved in oak in the chair of the grand Cathedral. In the

Uffizi Palace at Florence, there is a celebrated portrait of Columbus, and in the adjoining Pitti Palace is a bronze statue with four figures surrounding it, by Professor Costoli; and in the Brignolia Palace Columbus is the central figure of a fine bronze statuette group. In Genoa, Bologna, Florence, Milan, Rome, Turin, Naples and other Italian cities, may be seen *vias corsos*, and *piazas* named Colombo, and in Italian collections are countless portraits and statues of the great Genoese. In Rome is a large bust of Columbus by Faventurus, presented to the Museum in 1818 by Canova, and at Venice is the noble monument of Canova in the Franciscan Church. In Naples is a noble painting by Molinavo, in which Columbus, obscure and poor, is explaining his great plan to the Prior of La Rabida and his monks, while his son Diego is in the background receiving bread and water from the porter. At the Naples Hospital is a splendid marble group, life-sized, of Columbus, Dante Giotto, and St. Francis of Assisi. In the Marciano Library at Venice is a large sixteenth century map, with a full length portrait of Columbus and another of Marco Polo. There are now found at Genoa, Savona, Meglia and other neighborhoods of Genoa, members of the Colombo family still living.

San Domingo, too, is a city full of traditions, memories and relics of Columbus. After abandoning the first city, Isabella, Columbus founded and built the city of San Domingo, adjacent to the newly discovered mines of gold: it is a walled city, built after the Spanish style, contains to-day about fifteen thousand inhabitants and is the oldest European settlement in the world of Columbus. The walls were built in 1504, and so solidly that they are now in good preservation. It is built on a bluff facing the Caribbean Sea, at the mouth of the Ozama River, near the mines, and here the ships of Columbus rode at anchor in his later expeditions. At the entrance of the river in the southeast bastion is the famous Homenaji, or castle, still formidable with its ports and turrets, and in it is still shown to visitors the room in which Columbus was imprisoned and chained. A little further along the Ozama stand the ruins of the viceregal palace built by Diego Columbus, son and successor of the great Admiral. What was three and a half centuries ago the centre of European power in America, whose halls were graced by the beauty and chivalry of Spanish America, led by the second Admiral and Viceroy and the first vice-queen, the lovely Dona Maria de Toledo, niece of the illustrious Duke of Alva, is now reduced to the humble uses of a stable and hen-coop. A little further to the left is now seen the little chapel built by Columbus, the shrine where he often prayed and suffered. Near to this is the famous sundial he erected at a cost of \$60,000, and which is still in use. The city with its ancient ruins and buildings, its massive walls, its low



built houses with courtyards and ample doors, and gardens; its fountains, plaza, convents and churches, narrow sidewalks, is a picturesque sight. Here too, trod Columbus and his sons and brothers, the great and venerable Las Casas, Cortez, Pizarro, the conquered Indian chiefs, and many other historical characters, including the noted Alonzo de Ovido, the undaunted hero of many reckless deeds, who is buried under the arch of the Franciscan Convent now in ruins, the grave being so placed as he directed, and said, "that every one who entered there might tread upon his grave and be reminded of the instability of human fortune." A half a mile above the city, on the banks of the Ozama is the Well of Columbus, which is still running. Amid the many quaint buildings of the city and above them all towers the fine Cathedral, facing the Plaza, and measuring two hundred feet in length and one hundred in width, and cruciform. It is sombre and imposing in its exterior and interior. Its interior is devotional, and rich in historic memories of the great Admiral. On the right opposite the main door, embedded in the wall of a small chapel, is the mahogany cross which Columbus erected "to the glory of God," on the mountain of Santo Cerro, where he gazed admiringly down upon the Royal Vega. Facing the chancel upon the right is a small dark chapel, where rests the grave of the bishop who founded the sacred structure surmounted by his recumbent statue, and beyond this is a low dark vault, to which leads a low barred door, lighted by a dim taper; the vault is sacredly guarded, for here rests the casket containing, as the San Domingoans contend, the mortal remains of Columbus. Fronting the same plaza is the Columbian monument and statue already mentioned. Only visitors of eminence are allowed to enter the vault of Columbus and then only by special permission; the visit must be made in the presence of three officials and the visitors, officials and all present must sign their names in a book kept for that purpose; then the glass casket is 't'it from the vault; it is well secured with bands and sealed with the seal of the State. Within the casket is a small open zinc box containing a few human bones and a glass vase or jar containing human dust. These relics are claimed to be all that is mortal remaining of the great Admiral. The same claim is made on behalf of the Cathedral of Havana. It is to be lamented that this controversy exists in relation to the last resting place of so illustrious a benefactor of mankind.

The most signal posthumous honor paid to the memory of Columbus is that magnificent circular letter issued in his honor by the illustrious Pontiff, Leo XIII., on July 16, 1892, and addressed to the archbishops and bishops of Spain, Italy and the two Americas. It would be a satisfaction, if space permitted, to lay the

entire letter of our Holy Father before our readers in the pages of this REVIEW, *in perpetuam rei memoriam*, but a passage or two must now suffice :

“From the end of the fifteenth century, when a man from Liguria first landed, under the auspices of God, on the transatlantic shores, humanity has been strongly inclined to celebrate with gratitude the recollection of this event. It would certainly not be an easy matter to find a more worthy cause to touch their hearts and to inflame their zeal. The event, in effect, is such in itself that no other epoch has seen a grander and more beautiful one accomplished by man ; as to him who accomplished it, there are few who can be compared with him in greatness of soul and of genius. By his work a new world flashed forth from the unexplored ocean ; thousands upon thousands of mortals were returned to the common society of the human race, led from their barbarous life to peacefulness and civilization, and, what is of much more importance, recalled from perdition to eternal life by the bestowal of the gifts which Jesus Christ brought to the world.

“Europe, astonished alike by the novelty and the prodigiousness of this unexpected event, understood little by little, in due course of time what she owed to Columbus, when by sending colonies to America, by frequent communications, by exchange of services, by the resources confided to the sea and received in return, there was discovered an accession of the most favorable character possible to the knowledge of nature, to the reciprocal abundance of riches, with the result that the prestige of Europe increased enormously.

“Therefore it would not be fitting, amid these numerous testimonials of honor and in these concerts of felicitations, that the Church should maintain complete silence, since, in accordance with her character and her institution, she willingly approves and endeavors to favor all that appears, wherever it is, to be worthy of honor and praise. Undoubtedly she reserves particular and supreme honors to the virtues pre-eminent in regard to morality, inasmuch as they concern the eternal salvation of souls ; nevertheless she does not despise the rest, neither does she abstain from esteeming them as they deserve ; it is even her habit to favor with all her power and to have in honor, those who have well merited of human society and who have passed to posterity.

“Certainly God is admirable in His saints ; but the vestiges of His divine virtue appear as imprinted in those in whom shines a superior force of soul and mind, for this elevation of heart and this spark of genius could only come from God, their author and protector.

“There is in addition an entirely special reason for which we believe we should commemorate in a grateful spirit this immortal event.

It is that Columbus is one of us. When one considers with what motive above all he undertook the plan of exploring the dark sea, and with what object he endeavored to realize this plan, one cannot doubt that the Catholic faith superlatively inspired the enterprise and its execution, so that by this title also humanity is indebted to the Church.

"Then, once fairly at sea, while the waters agitate themselves, while the crew murmurs, he maintains, under God's care, a calm constancy of mind. His plan manifests itself in the very names which he imposes on the new islands, and each time that he is called upon to land upon one of them he worships the Almighty God, and only takes possession of it in the name of Jesus Christ.

"Whatever coast he approaches, his first idea is to plant on the shore the sacred sign of the cross; and the divine name of the Redeemer, which he had sung so frequently on the open sea, to the sound of the murmuring waves—he is the first to make it reverberate in the new islands. In the same way, when he institutes the Spanish colony, he causes it to be commenced by the construction of a temple, where he first provides that the popular fetes shall be celebrated by august ceremonies.

"In order to celebrate worthily and in a manner suitable to the truth of the facts the solemn anniversary of Columbus, the sacredness of religion must be united to the splendor of the civil pomp. This is why, as previously, at the first announcement of the event public acts of thanksgiving were rendered to the providence of the immortal God, upon the example which the Supreme Pontiff gave, the same also now, in celebrating the recollection of the auspicious event. We esteem that we must do as much.

"We decree to this effect that the day of October 12th or the following Sunday, if the respective diocesan bishops judge it to be opportune, after the office of the day, the solemn Mass of the Most Holy Trinity shall be celebrated in the cathedral and collegial churches of Spain, Italy and the two Americas."

It is quite unnecessary to advert in detail to the movements now made throughout the world, and especially in America, Spain and Italy, to celebrate with unparalleled splendor the achievement of Columbus in this the quadri-centennial of that peerless event in the history of the world. That the government and people of the United States have expended many millions in preparations to hold the Columbian World's Fair in honor of the Admiral, that the grandest naval review ever held will now be given by the navies of all nations in the harbor of New York, that the day designated according to the new style, or Gregorian calendar, on the 21st of October, has been made a national holiday, that grand national and local celebrations will be held throughout the land, and solemn



religious services and thanksgivings will be held in every diocese in the country, and celebrations more or less similar to these will be held in Spain and Italy, and in the other countries of the two Americas, are only so many evidences of the unequalled posthumous honors now and everywhere heaped upon the name and memory of Columbus. And as future centuries roll around the name and memory of Columbus will be venerated with imperishable honors.

Among the posthumous honors rendered to Christopher Columbus has been a reaction, natural though limited, yet increasing, in favor of the name of Columbia. Our study of the subject has led us to observe that, while America is the legal, practical, and everyday name of our country, yet wherever there is question or sentiment of an ideal country—a country of song, poetry and patriotism—the name preferred is Columbia. This will be seen by our national anthems, such as "*Hail Columbia*," and the patriotic song, "*Columbia*," written by Timothy Dwight, while a chaplain in the Revolutionary Army, in 1777-78, commencing thus :

"Columbia, Columbia, to glory arise,  
The Queen of the world and the child of the skies,"

and other national airs. In the nomenclature of American geography the name Columbia has also gained ground. An immense country in the northwestern portion of our continent is called British Columbia, and its great continental river is called the Columbia. So, too, one of the South American republics is called *The United States of Colombia*. The State of Ohio has named its capital Columbus, and the State of South Carolina has Columbia for its capital. The State of New York and six other states have Columbia counties, and many towns bear that name. When we became independent states, the principal seat of learning in the city of New York changed its name from King's College, which it had received from King George II., to that of Columbia College. And when our Fathers selected a site for the seat of the national government, they called it the District of Columbia, and by naming the national capital Washington, they appropriately linked together forever the names of Columbus and Washington.

RICHARD H. CLARKE.

---

A RETROSPECT (*Continued*).

THE first part of this retrospect was terminated by various references to Augustus Welby Pugin, who was undoubtedly the great originator of the revival of ecclesiastical art, as it had existed in its greatest glory during the Middle Ages. The spirit he had set going entirely dominated Oscott at the time of my residence there, with the complete approval and active support of Bishop (afterwards Cardinal) Wiseman.

The most significant symbol of this spirit was the large chasuble, which was used at Oscott, as it was also at the Cathedral of the Vicariate—St. Chad's, Birmingham. No one can deny that it is a far more graceful and dignified vestment than is the rigid garment of Italy and France, with its square lower border. Surely there can be few objects of ecclesiastical art more important than the eucharistic vestment of the priest who offers the greatest of all sacrifices, that of Holy Mass!

I recollect being near the High Altar of St. Peter's on Christmas Day, 1869, when Pius IX. sang High Mass during the Vatican Council. As he came from the altar he passed almost close to me, and it was impossible not to perceive how far more majestic and dignified must have been the appearance of the Pontiff's predecessors; such as Innocent III., or the Pope whose tomb fronts the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament at St. Peter's, his effigy bearing a chasuble with ample folds.

At the time of my stay at Oscott, the large chasuble was rapidly extending over the whole of England (where it still holds its own in the North and West), and was destined to spread in France, Belgium and Northern Germany.

That it did not extend into the South, is not wonderful in our day. There was a time when Italy justly held an acknowledged sway over Europe, in matters both of art and science; but that time has long passed away; and it is Northern Europe, and the nations which thence have sprung, which now really lead the van of civilization, in the domains of both science and art.

But even in Italy the large chasuble persisted much longer than is commonly supposed, and no authoritative decree or declaration was the cause of its curtailment. The Rev. Father Lockhart, of the Order of Charity and of St. Etheldreda's, London, has recently published a small work<sup>1</sup> to show this. Therein he points out how

<sup>1</sup> *The Chasuble, Its Form and Size.* London, Burns & Oates, 1891.

St. Charles Borromeo, the great restorer (under the authority of the Council of Trent), of ecclesiastical discipline, and of the solemnity of public worship, laid down as the minimum width of the chasuble the measure of "three cubits"—or somewhat more than sixty English inches—and directed that it should "hang over the arms, with one fold at least, below each shoulder. As regards the length of the chasuble, he distinctly said that it is to "reach nearly to the heels"—*pæne ad talos pertingat*. Father Lockhart concludes<sup>1</sup> that it is no real innovation, and requires no special permission, to make vestments of the size prescribed by St. Charles; and such are now made for and used in the Church of St. Etheldreda, in London.

But to return to our present retrospect:

The College of St. Mary's Oscott is situated in one of the most healthy regions in England. Even the great manufacturing city of Birmingham is (in spite of its smoky chimneys) quite exceptionally salubrious, so much so that an old gentleman, a connection of the 16th Earl of Shrewsbury, left the country and came to reside in that city for the benefit of his health. The remarkable healthiness of Birmingham is due to the great thickness of the red-sandstone formation on which it stands and which most effectually aids its excellent drainage.

But the country near Oscott was, in 1845, exceptionally attractive from its picturesqueness. Immediately adjacent was the widespread heather of "Sutton Coldfield," while close by were extensive woods—with ponds and streams—part of the old primeval forest of England which has since been cut down. This alas! has now lost its charm of wildness and has become a public park.

Amongst the divines and one or two senior students of uncertain future, a small society was formed for the regular daily recitation, in choir, of the whole of the divine office. Of this society the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer was the head. Mr. Renouf was also a member of it, and his private pupil then and there acquired a love for this liturgical worship which he has never lost. We occupied the stalls on either side of the sanctuary, and met in the forenoon to say Prime, Tierce, Sext and None; in the afternoon we assembled for vespers and compline, while after night prayers we recited the matins and lauds of the following day. The ceremonies of Holy Week were carried out at Oscott with great perfection, and people were in the habit of coming from considerable distances to witness them.

When Newman and his Oxford disciples, who had just been received into the Church, made their first appearance at Oscott,

<sup>1</sup> *Op. Cit.*, p. 19.



the humble unobtrusive demeanor of men so distinguished, made a strong impression on the minds of some of the lads. Amongst the smaller boys was little John Acton, whose duty it was to support Bishop Wiseman's train at great ceremonies. Now, as Lord Acton, he is known throughout the cultivated world. Another lad, whose beautiful soprano voice was the delight of our choir and congregation, has now for more than a quarter of a century been known at Rome first as Monsignor, of late as Archbishop, and probably will be soon saluted as "Cardinal" Stonor.

Dr. Wiseman's sympathies were strongly conservative, and lay with the Austrians in their domination of Italy, certainly not with the "Liberals" of that peninsula. On the death of Gregory the Sixteenth, news came to the Bishop of the election as Pope of Cardinal Ferretti. Great was his joy, and the boys were assembled to be informed of the good news—for that cardinal was a strong supporter of the Austrians and of the old ways. Alas! a little later he heard that the new Pope was Cardinal Mastai Ferretti, so well known for his liberalism that his predecessor had said: "In casa Mastai anche il gatto é liberale!"—"In the Mastai's house, even the cat is a liberal!"

Amongst the distinguished foreigners who visited Oscott, was Count Montalembert—then an ardent follower of the prince who subsequently would neither abdicate nor allow himself to be placed upon the French throne; and who practically completed the ruin of the dynasty which his grandfather (first as the Count d'Artois, and afterwards as Charles X.), did more than any other man in France to destroy.

We saw a good deal of the religious condition of France just before and just after the fall of Louis Phillippe. The unsympathetic attitude of that king to the Church, and the readiness of his government to commit slight acts of hostility to it, had ended by largely destroying the previously long-standing popular animosity to the "*partie-prêtre*"; and certainly when the republic was proclaimed, in 1848, there were no public demonstrations of hatred to the Church as there had been in the revolution of 1830. But to this subject we shall have occasion to return.

Meanwhile in England the Church grew and thrived amazingly. Every year after that which witnessed Newman's submission saw a number of important converts added to its ranks. Newman, Oakley, Ward and the other High Church Anglican leaders were followed by members of other clergy whose names are less widely known, and ultimately by two whose influence has been profound. One of these was Mr. Henry William Wilberforce, Vicar of East Farleigh, in Kent, and son of the Rev. William Wilberforce, the friend of Pitt and a member of the House of Commons for more

than half a century. Henry Wilberforce was received into the Church in the chapel of the Jesuits at Brussels, on the 15th September, 1850, and was confirmed on the 21st by the Cardinal-archbishop of Malines, in the chapel of the seminary. He was impelled to enter the Church on account of a celebrated judgment in what was known as the "Gorham case," wherein it was decided that the question of baptismal regeneration was an open one in the Anglican Church.

The same cause produced a similar effect on the second of these converts to whom I have just referred—I mean Archbishop Manning, who became the new Archbishop of Westminster, and whose decease is now widely deplored in England.

During this prosperous time—between 1840 and 1850—the desire arose and spread to have once again a national hierarchy, in the place of the old government by vicars apostolic, under which the Catholic Church in England had prospered so greatly.

Petitions to this end were sent to Rome. In 1846, two bishops went to the Holy City to advocate the change, and in 1848, yet another was delegated to the Holy See with still more earnest petitions for an increase of bishops and the establishment of the hierarchy. The preliminary arrangements were indeed then concluded, when the troubles which befell the Roman States put a temporary stop to the execution of the plan. An understanding had, however, been arrived at with the English government, which appeared satisfied so long as no bishop was created with any of the titles then borne by members of the Anglican Episcopate.

Little did any one in England, lay or clerical, dream of the storm of fanaticism, the fever of intolerance, and above all the amazing stupidity which were to display themselves far and wide over the land when this change became known, and was stigmatized as the "*Papal aggression*." It was the last memorable outbreak of the "No Popery" spirit, and will ever have great historical interest. We who witnessed it can, through it, understand the bloody consequences of the similar movement (in less civilized times), initiated and carried on by the ever infamous Titus Oates, more than a hundred and fifty years before. The great figure which aroused and ultimately calmed this national turmoil was Cardinal Wiseman, of whom it may be useful here to put before our readers a few biographical details.

He was descended from an Irish family long resident in Spain, and was born at Seville, in 1802. He was therefore but forty-nine years old at the time of the "*Papal aggression*."

As a youth he was educated first at Ushaw, and afterwards in the English College at Rome, publishing, when but eighteen years old, a Latin work on Oriental languages. Subsequently he became

a professor in the Roman University, and afterwards Rector of the English College. In 1835, he returned to England, and in that year and the next preached several series of sermons which attracted great attention and admiration. Then he went to Rome, and in 1840 the number of English vicars apostolic was doubled, and Dr. Wiseman was appointed coadjutor to Dr. Walsh, of the central district. In 1847 he again went to Rome and he was made Pro-Vicar Apostolic of the London district, in the place of Dr. Griffiths, deceased. Subsequently, Dr. Walsh was translated to London, and Dr. Wiseman made his coadjutor there, with the right of succession.

Dr. Wiseman was naturally fond of all that was stately, majestic and artistic, and he would have made an admirable cardinal of the age of the "Renaissance." His foreign education rendered it impossible to be thoroughly "in touch" with English ways and feelings, and he more than once aroused opposition and hostility by his very efforts to conciliate and please.

At last the hour came : the apostolical letter of Pius IX., signed by Cardinal Lambruschini, and dated the 29th September, 1850, appeared, and Dr., then Cardinal, Wiseman published his celebrated pastoral, some incautious expressions in which greatly excited the popular ire. We well recollect being in the Jesuits' church, at Farm street, and being ourselves struck by the style in which certain, really very simple facts, were announced to ignorant and unprepared ears. In his pastoral he declared : "At present, and till such time as the Holy See shall think fit otherwise to provide, *we govern, and shall continue to govern*,<sup>1</sup> the counties of Middlesex, Hertford and Essex *as ordinary thereof*, and those of Surrey, Sussex, Kent, Berkshire and Hampshire, with the islands annexed, *as administrator with an ordinary jurisdiction*.

"Further, we have to announce to you that, as if still further to add solemnity and honor to this noble act of apostolic authority, and to give an additional mark of paternal benevolence towards the Catholics of England, his Holiness was pleased to raise us in the private consistory of Monday, the 30th of September, to the rank of Cardinal Priest of the Holy Roman Church. And on the Thursday next ensuing, being the third day of this month of October, in public consistory, he delivered to us the insignia of this dignity, the cardinalitial hat, assigning us afterwards for our title in the private consistory which we attended, the Church of St. Pudentiana, in which St. Peter is generally believed to have enjoyed the hospitality of the noble and partly British family of the Senator Pudens.

---

<sup>1</sup> The italics are, of course, ours.



"In that same consistory we were enabled ourselves to ask for the Archiepiscopal Pallium, for our new See of Westminster; and this day we have been invested, by the hands of the Supreme Pastor and Pontiff himself, with the badge of *Metropolitan jurisdiction*.

"*This great work, then, is complete; what you have long desired and prayed for is granted; your beloved country has received a place among the fair Churches which form the splendid aggregate of Catholic Communion: Catholic England has been restored to its orbit in the ecclesiastical firmament, from which its light had vanished, and begins now to show its course of regularly adjusted action round the centre of unity. . . .*

"Given out of the Flaminian Gate of Rome, this seventh day of October, MDCCCL.

NICHOLAS,

Cardinal-archbishop of Westminster.

By command of His Eminence,

FRANCIS SEARLE, *Secretary*."

It is frequently surprising to thoughtful persons how very often mere assertion suffices to produce belief. Incredible as it may seem, a multitude of persons in England then thought that the Pope's action, if not opposed by some special enactment, would alone suffice to make the ecclesiastical position of the new Cardinal *legal* and capable of being *enforced by law*. His assertion, therefore, that he "governed and would continue to govern" as "ordinary," or with "ordinary jurisdiction," produced real alarm—an alarm increased by the statement that "the great work was complete," and "England restored to its orbit round the centre of unity." The Cardinal distinctly asserted that a great change "long desired and prayed for," had been "completed." Ordinary persons, ignorant of matters Catholic, might, then, be pardoned for thinking this meant something more than that a mere modification in the relations of Catholics amongst themselves had taken place.

The Archbishop's stately and elaborate mode of reference to "the cardinalitial hat," and other personal details, ending with the notice about "the badge of Metropolitan jurisdiction," were not to English Protestant taste, and men's teeth were set on edge by the semi-royal "Given out of the Flaminian Gate of Rome," and the secretarial signature "by *command* of His Eminence."

But the effect produced by this somewhat injudicious pastoral was still further intensified by certain expressions in the apostolical letter signed by Cardinal Lambruschini.

The manner in which England appeared to be parcelled out in groups of counties, with seeming utter disregard to what county

authorities might say, was startling ; but certain expressions were more startling still.

Whether the established Church of England was " Catholic " or not, was a question which its members were accustomed to hear canvassed without vexation ; but no one had denied it its exclusive right to the title of "*the Anglican Church*." Yet the Pope says : " We shall continue to avail ourselves of the instrumentality of the said congregation (referring to Propaganda) in all things appertaining to the *Anglican Churches*."

He further adds a statement which many foolish persons thought meant immediate " dis-establishment and dis-endowment " of the State Church ; for Cardinal Lambruschini writes : " Whatever regulations, either in the ancient system of the Anglican Churches, or in the subsequent missionary state, may have been in force either by special institutions, or privileges, or peculiar customs, shall *henceforth carry no weight nor obligation* ; and in order that no doubt may remain on this point, we by the plenitude of our Apostolic authority, repeal and abrogate *all power whatsoever* of imposing obligations or conferring rights in those peculiar constitutions and privileges of whatever kind they may be, and in all customs by *whomsoever*, or at *whatever more ancient or immemorial time* brought in."

He also refers to " the rights and privileges of the ancient Sees of England " and declares that such (and other things in opposition to the new departure) " we expressly annul and repeal " and adds : " Moreover we decree that if, in *any other manner, any other attempt* shall be made by *any persons*, or by *any authority* to set aside these enactments, such attempt shall be null and void."

This seemed to some people a challenge indeed ; the storm quickly burst, and as every one in England and very many in America probably know, the signal for political action was given by a then minister, Lord John Russell in his celebrated " Durham letter."

That epistle to the Bishop of Durham is dated November 4th, and in it occur the following passages :

" My dear Lord : I agree with you in considering the late aggression of the Pope upon our Protestantism as ' insolent and insidious,' and I therefore feel as indignant as you can do upon the subject. . . . There is an assumption of power in all the documents which have come from Rome—a pretension to supremacy over the realm of England and a claim to the whole and undivided sway, which is inconsistent with the Queen's supremacy. . . . There is however a danger which alarms me much more than any assertion of a foreign sovereign. Clergymen of our own Church,

who have subscribed to the Thirty-nine Articles, and acknowledged in explicit terms the Queen's supremacy, have been the most forward in leading their flocks step by step to the very verge of the precipice. The honor paid to saints, the claim of infallibility for the Church, the superstitious use of the sign of the Cross, the muttering of the liturgy, so as to disguise the language in which it is written, the recommendation of auricular confession, and the administration of penance and absolution:—all these things are pointed out by clergymen of the Church of England. . . . I have little hope that the propounders and framers of these innovations will desist from their *insidious* course. But I rely with confidence on the people of England, and I will not bate a jot of heart or hope so long as the glorious principles and the immortal martyrs of the Reformation shall be held in reverence by the great mass of the nation which looks with contempt on the mummeries of superstition, and with scorn at the laborious endeavors which are now making to confine the intellect and enslave the soul.

“I remain with great respect, etc.,

J. RUSSELL.”

DOWNING STREET, Nov. 4th.

Thereupon followed a long succession of bishops' charges, addresses, petitions as absurd and as impotent in their results as the penal law which was subsequently enacted. There was an address to the Queen from the bishops of the Established Church, two others from the universities of Oxford and Cambridge and one from the Lord Mayor and Corporation of the City of London. The civic dignities went down in great state to the Queen at Windsor Castle, the railway company which conveyed them from London having arranged to carry seventy private carriages and two hundred horses.

On arriving at Slough a procession was formed, when the Lord Mayor (preceded by his footmen in their state liveries, his household in their carriages and the City Marshal on horseback) rode in his state carriage, drawn by six horses and attended by his sword-bearer, and his chaplain with other functionaries. He was followed by the Aldermen and Sheriffs and the other members of the Corporation in their carriages.

After entering the castle they were received by the Queen seated in St. George's Hall surrounded by various of her ministers—amongst them Lord John Russell—lords and ladies in waiting, pages of honor, etc. Prince Albert received the address and presented it to the Queen. It contained the following passage:

“We learn with feelings of surprise and indignation that the Bishop of Rome has recently issued a bull, whereby he not only



presumes to partition this country into pretended dioceses of the Church of Rome, but at the same time assumes the right of appointing archbishops and bishops of such dioceses and conferring upon them territorial titles and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, all which we deem to be inconsistent with the principles of our Constitution in Church and State, an invasion of your Majesty's royal supremacy, an audacious usurpation of your Majesty's prerogative of alone bestowing titles of honor, and a grievous insult to this Protestant nation. For remedy whereof we earnestly entreat that your Majesty will direct such measures to be taken as in your royal wisdom shall seem expedient, assuring your Majesty, that you may ever confidently rely on the affectionate and cordial support of a large, united and religious people."

In February, 1851, there was introduced into the House of Commons "a bill to prevent the assumption of certain ecclesiastical titles in respect of places in the United Kingdom." Three hundred and ninety-five members voted for its introduction and only sixty-three against it. This bill which was shortly passed (and has only of late been repealed) contained, after a long preamble, the following "special clauses:"

"I. If, after the passing of this Act, any person other than a person thereunto authorized by law in respect of an archbishopric, bishopric or deanery of the United Church of England and Ireland assume or use the name, style or title of archbishop, bishop or dean of any city, town or place, or of any territory or district (under any designation or description whatsoever) in the United Kingdom, whether such city, town or place, or such territory or district, be or be not the see or the province, or co-extensive with the province, of any archbishop, in the see or the diocese, or co-extensive with the diocese of any bishop, in the seat or place of the Church of any dean, or co-extensive with any deanery, of the said United Church, the person so offending shall, for every such offense, forfeit and pay the sum of *one hundred pounds*.

"II. Any deed or writing made, signed or executed after the passing of this Act, by or under the authority of any person, in or under any name, style, or title which such person is by this Act prohibited from assuming or using, shall be void."

This *brutum fulmen* was passed hardly more than forty years ago; and when we view it in the light of the present public opinion which prevails in England it seems hardly credible that such ignorance of the first principles of religious freedom should have continued down to so late a date. To American readers it must seem a strange fact indeed.

But stranger still, it was not only Protestants who were scandalized at so really simple a matter as the rearrangement spontane-

ously made by Catholics of their own voluntary arrangements among themselves; but certain socially eminent and highly-placed Catholics were hardly less disturbed. Certain Catholic laymen attended a meeting in Yorkshire called by the high sheriff with respect to an address to the crown on the "papal oppression," and to it some noble lords and other eminent laymen gave their written adhesion.

Not long afterwards, as if to mark the appreciation of such opposition by the sovereign, the queen, with the prince consort, went to a distinguished nobleman's house where a special and most stately banquet was held, as is duly represented in the illustrated journal of that day.

The wonderful and widespread storm which arose so suddenly and resulted in acts so deplorable, fell with almost as much rapidity, being in great measure stilled by the ardent efforts of Cardinal Wiseman.

Soon peace returned and religious matters seemed to be settling down much as they were before the establishment of what was after all somewhat inappropriately termed the "hierarchy"; since the new organization consisted and still consists but of a true hierarchy's highest members. Little difference, however, was at first noticeable, at least to laymen. The bishops—notably the bishops of Birmingham, Northampton, Nottingham, Hereford and Hexham—were still zealous in seeking to demonstrate to High Church Protestants the real identity between the old Church of England as it was when Henry VIII. came to the throne and the organization just erected.

They seemed fully to realize how much men's minds are influenced by externals, and regulated their rules and actions in this respect at once by the dictates of the scholastic philosophy and the ever memorable injunction of Gregory the Great to St. Augustine to make use of what was local and national for the benefit of what was universal and catholic. Little by little, however, the stream of conversion shrank. Certainly the number of distinguished Anglican ecclesiastics who submitted became annually less, and it was abundantly clear that the hopes of those who looked forward to a speedy *conversion* of England were terribly mistaken. Meanwhile, not only did the Catholic movement diminish, but the Anglican Church began to gain strength more and more as soon as the shock of the conversions of Wilberforce and Manning had finally come to an end.

Meantime a new tendency began to gain prominence in the Catholic Church in England, *pari passu* with the great reaction in France, which was following upon Louis Napoleon's *coup d'état*.

During the republic which began in 1848, that very influential, and, as I believe, fatally influential journalist, Louis Veuillot, wrote in the most ultra democratic vein.

His well-known organ, *L'Univers*, adopted and defended the strongest opinions of the school, far beyond what was necessary to maintain the ecclesiastical liberty which the second republic had rather welcomed than merely tolerated after the fall of Louis Philippe. But no sooner had the *coup d'état* been effected and the prince-president shown his inclination to acquire the support of churchmen for his despotism, than Veuillot completely changed his policy and became the advocate of absolutism. Not a few ecclesiastics and some prominent laymen followed him and openly renounced those principles of moderate liberty, so prized in England and America, hailing enthusiastically the new Cæsar.

Thereupon once more followed consequences similar to those which had resulted from the alliance of the altar with the throne under the Restoration.

The Church had then been widely detested; under the disfavor of the citizen king it had regained popularity, which was augmented under the republic. As allied with the Emperor Napoleon III., its unpopularity speedily returned. We well recollect meeting at Bruges some Frenchmen who had been driven away through fear of the consequences of the *coup d'état*. Addressing us as an English Catholic, they said: "Sir, we assure you we honestly approved of the liberty the Church had gained, and desired to maintain it on the basis of liberty and freedom for all citizens. But *now*, after the principles firmly professed have been thus repudiated, when favors and wealth have been accepted from hands red with the blood of citizens slain so that he might attain a throne, only to be gained by murder as well as perjury; *now*, when we return, we will allow such liberty no longer; monks shall be expelled, churches shall be closed, and Catholics will rue the day when they became false to the freedom they had hypocritically affected to favor."

It is not for us to judge the excuses offered for acts thus complained of; but the unhappy results of those acts are indeed too plainly to be seen to-day, and much do we fear that only after much suffering and persecution, if ever, will the *Church in France* regain the averted sympathies of the effective part of the nation.

During this very time arose into prominence that new tendency amongst the Catholic clergy of England to which we have alluded—a tendency to popular Italian devotions. This was greatly promoted by Newman and Faber when they joined the Oratorians and initiated a special devotion to St. Philip Neri and a practical preference for saints of the post-mediæval period. The spirit which animated the Oratories of Birmingham and London were, however, not identical. The latter, under Father Faber, appeared more conspicuously Italian, and began a series of lives of the saints which



aroused much antagonism and was ultimately stopped. The practice of reciting and singing Latin in the Italian mode, which was previously very rare, became much more common, and a desire increased to have churches and church ornaments, vestments and sacred vessels no longer in the style of the Church in England as it was, but in that of the Church in Italy as it is.

It has been the constant Catholic practice to conciliate different nations in various ways, and the illustrious Pontiff, now happily reigning, has notably sought to conciliate races of Eastern Rites. It is surely a common-sense policy to develop points of contact, to conciliate national feelings so far as this can be done without sacrificing principles, and above all to avoid setting men's backs up by needless opposition in matters unessential.

The illustrious first Archbishop of Westminster, during the fourteen years he occupied the see, lived down all violent opposition and much prejudice. We saw him cordially received and heartily applauded at the Royal Institution where he once lectured on "Science and Art." Yet he never gained a wide welcome in English society outside the Catholic Church, and the last years of his life were chiefly passed in retirement at his country house in Essex.

He felt very keenly the anxiety and distress, in which all Catholics participated, on the declaration of war between France and Austria, in 1859, the first decisive step in the overthrow of the Pope's civil principedom. We had been impressed, years before, by the words of Cardinal Pacca as to the probability that in the order of God's providence that principedom was destined to come to a speedy end; and we were, therefore, very anxious that this probability should not be so unappreciated by Catholics as to lead them to neglect the requisite pecuniary provisions for such an eventuality.

It seemed to us, and to one or two friends with whom we spoke, that the time had come for an attempt to restore the ancient tribute of Peter's Pence to the Holy See.

We obtained for this purpose the hearty concurrence of Sir George Bowyer,—then George Bowyer, Esq., M.P.,—and the following hand-bill was circulated towards the end of the year 1859:

"You are requested to attend with your Catholic friends, a Meeting which will be held on Tuesday, November 20th, at 8 P.M., at the Hanover Square Rooms, for the promotion of a St. Peter's Pence Association. George Bowyer, Esq., M.P., in the Chair."

About three hundred persons attended the meeting; but in consequence of a communication received through Dr. Grant, Bishop of Southwark, from the Cardinal Secretary of State, a change was made as to the name of the association. The Cardinal Secretary

said that although the Holy Father was not in want at present of the offerings of the faithful, he much desired an expression of their sympathy. Accordingly, the title was changed from "The St. Peter's Pence Association" to that of "The S.S. Peter and Paul Association"; and at a meeting held nine days later the following resolutions were passed:

"I. That the S.S. Peter and Paul Association be formed to collect names for an address to the Holy Father, and to promote by every means dutiful and affectionate veneration for his sacred office and person; and also to be ready, at such times as circumstances may render it useful, to collect offerings in aid of the Holy Father, and the Association consist of members each undertaking to promote the object of the Association under the direction of the Upper Committee.

"II. That the Association have its members organized in Local Committees, to be formed in every parish, and meetings once a month to discuss the interests of the Association.

"III. That for the same purpose, in every town or district when Local Committees are sufficiently near to each other, a Special Committee be formed, consisting of two members for each Local Committee of the town or district, and meeting once every three months at least.

"IV. That the Special Committee of London act as an Upper Committee, to correspond with all the committees in England and with any general direction of the Association which may be established; and that, before beginning its operations, every committee obtain the sanction of the Upper Committee and receive the approval of the ecclesiastical authorities.

"V. That Messrs. George Bowyer, M.P., St. George Mivart, Samuel J. Nicholl, Archibald J. Dunn, Thomas Egan, and George J. Wigley act as Provisional Committee of the Association, with power to add to their number."

An address to His Holiness was forwarded by the Provisional Committee on January 1, 1866, and a request was in the meantime issued by the Holy Father that the faithful *should* come in aid to the treasury of the Pontifical Government in its struggle against the enemies of religion throughout Europe; and accordingly, on January 12th, a circular was issued by the president, and Messrs. Wigley and Nicholl, Honorary Secretaries, immediately instituted collections by the Association of weekly pence throughout the country; and thus it was that three and thirty years ago Peter's Pence came once more to be collected in England.

ST. GEORGE MIVART.

## THE FRIARS OF THE WEST INDIES.

WILL the friars and their work in the New World be properly represented, either at Chicago, Genoa, Madrid, Huelva, or wherever else the festivities of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America are going to be celebrated?

Will the religious orders, whether Franciscans or Dominicans, Augustinians or Jesuits, receive the credit which belongs to them in the work of civilizing the newly-discovered countries from the banks of the St. Lawrence to the mouth of La Plata?

Will friars and monks and monastic institutions be commemorated at those quadri-centennial displays, such as they have been in the New World—not only as pioneers and missionaries, but as strong elements of civilization, indefatigable educators of the people, strenuous opponents of oppression, and undaunted advocates of liberty and justice?

The work of the monks in Europe, wonderful as it is for magnitude, variety, and utmost importance in every respect, differs in many things from their work in America. In Europe the monastic orders had to save, and did save, all that could be saved, of the structure of ancient civilization, wrecked and demolished by the irresistible wave of barbarism. They had, besides, to clear, as they did clear, almost the whole area of central and northern Europe, and deliver, as they did, to agriculture what thus far had been covered with impenetrable forests, or consisted principally of impassable swamps and marshes. They had to copy manuscripts; to preserve the writings of the philosophers, orators, poets, historians, scientists, etc., who had flourished before the invasion of the northern barbarians, and which were hidden among the ruins of the Roman Empire; to cultivate the lands; to make roads and bridges;<sup>1</sup> they had to keep inns or hotels along the roads in order to give hospitality to the wayfarer; they had to perform police duties on the highways and on the sea, as in the case of the military orders; they had to do, in fine, many other things, independent of their own religious duties and general work of charity, which the peculiar circumstances of the times and localities had rendered necessary.

In Spain, to which when speaking of the New World we have to turn our eyes with all deference, the work of monks and mo-

---

<sup>1</sup> There was an order especially established for this purpose, the Bridge-builder Brothers—*Fratres Pontifices*.



nastic institutions had to be, and it was, especially diversified. "To the monks," says Doctor Don Francisco Martínez Marina,<sup>1</sup> "the Spanish nation owes not only the preservation of agriculture, but innumerable precious documents, chronicles, and materials for her history, without which very little or nothing could now be known of the important events of those days. They also occupied themselves in copying books, deeds, decisions of the councils, collections of old laws, whether secular or ecclesiastical, and in many other labors of the same character and importance. Spain owes to Vigila and his disciples, Sarracino and García, monks at Alvela, in 976, the famous 'Vigilanus Codex,' also called 'Alveldensis.' She owes, also, to Velasco and his disciple, Sisebrito, the not less celebrated 'Emilianensis Codex,' now preserved at San Millán de la Cogulla. Both works are very well known in the history of Spanish literature, and are entitled to the great celebrity which they enjoy in the world of letters."

The same learned author says: "The convents of Spain were asylums of religion, piety, learning, and public instruction, even in the most calamitous times. It is well known that the schools were in the cathedrals and in the convents. All the books of the time, and all records, either of private transactions or of public acts, were kept and preserved in the cloisters and in the sacristies. The abstemious and laborious life of the monks allowed them to have always at hand abundant means to attend to the necessities of the poor and to exercise the virtue of hospitality. They spent their time in teaching, in preaching, in writing, in copying all kinds of books, in tilling the fields and otherwise promoting agriculture, which at that time, owing to the general unsettled condition of things, and the state of almost perpetual war, was a pursuit in which only monks could engage with any kind of safety as well as perseverance and intelligence. To them, and to them only, it was due that a most extensive portion of the face of the world should cease to be a wilderness. They, especially the lay brothers, who used to be numerous, cut down the trees, cleared away the bushes, improved the ground, dug ditches and canals whenever necessary, built dams across the rivers, and acted with such energy that, in comparatively short time, they succeeded in converting entire regions abandoned and unsettled, absolutely impenetrable in some places, fit only to be, as they were, the domicile of wild beasts, into fertile lands, fruitful fields, smiling meadows, and luxuriant orchards and groves."

In addition to all this work, physical, intellectual, moral, and

<sup>1</sup> *Ensayo Historico Crítico sobre la Legislacion y Principales Cuerpos Legales de los Reinos de Leon y Castilla*. Madrid. 1834. (Critical and Historical Essay on the Legislation and Principal Collections of Laws of the Kingdoms of Leon and Castile.)

religious, the Spanish monks were called to perform, owing to the necessities of the times in their country, and therefore to an extent perhaps greater than their brethren anywhere else, the duty attended with more difficulties and dangers than at any other subsequent time, of protecting the lives of pilgrims, and travellers generally, and attending to their comfort and welfare. Through those admirable organizations, so full of interest and romance, known to history under the name of Spanish Military Orders, namely, the Knights of Alcantara, Montesa, Santiago, and San Juan de Jerusalem—strange combinations of monasticism and chivalry, standing monuments of the pliability and adaptability of Catholic faith to all the necessities of society—such services were rendered in this line as to make their remembrance eternal. Besides ensuring, by their presence, the lives of the travellers, as well as the property of travellers, those knight-brothers had hospitals and inns where shelter and attention were given to all who needed it; and in this way, while performing a work of charity, and fulfilling a moral and religious duty, they also promoted trade between the different sections of the country, and contributed to increase the national wealth and prosperity.

Nor was this wonderful work of the religious orders confined to the land alone. The noble orders which, under the invocation of *Nuestra Señora de la Merced*, were founded by Pedro Nolasco and Juan de Mata for the redemption of captives—as well as the knights of Malta and others—performed the same duty on the high seas, and more especially on the Mediterranean. While the well-equipped and always dreaded galleys of those orders kept the pirates at safe distance, or punished their boldness, when the occasion presented itself, the knight-fathers of La Merced attended on their part to the ransom of the captives made by the same pirates and their restitution to their homes. The United States of America owe to one branch of this order, which was established in Paris in the latter part of the last century, the freedom of no less than two hundred of their citizens, who had languished in captivity under the Dey of Algiers, from 1785 to 1795.<sup>1</sup>

In America, owing to her own peculiar conditions, and to the epoch of her discovery, the religious orders were not called to do all the work which they had done elsewhere, or to do it through the same channels and methods. They had before them a large and vast field, but this field in most respects was exclusively American. They had to encounter difficulties and evils, which at

---

<sup>1</sup> The writer of this paper had the pleasure and the honor to publish an article on this subject in the number of September 22, 1883, of the *Washington Catholic*, under the title of "The Mathurin Fathers: A Chapter of American History."

least in their own especial form had never at any time before presented themselves. They had no classical literature to save, or to restore. They had not to infuse new life into a civilization, otherwise magnificent, but which had been prostrated by its vices, nor were they called to moderate and smooth the fury of the barbarians. But they had to deal with the *mita*<sup>1</sup> and with the *repartimientos*<sup>2</sup> and with many other abominations which the Spaniards invented in the New World. They had to deal with men of iron, bold, uneducated, tyrannical beyond description, and who on account of the distance from the mother country, and the peculiar circumstances in which they found themselves, were almost all-powerful. They had also to undertake, even within the limits of the purely missionary work, a task of extreme difficulty and unprecedented hardship, with tribes and nations of various customs and languages, always under the spur of tyranny, and hating in most cases, and with abundant reason, all that came from Spain.<sup>3</sup> But they were equal to their task: they saw at once all the difficulties and responsibilities which the circumstances of the times and places devolved upon them; they grasped the situation fully, and recognized without difficulty what Divine Providence demanded from them. And although most of the work which they had to do was new and unexpected, and had peculiar difficulties and drawbacks, they did it so well, and so nobly, and so courageously, as to excite our unbounded admiration and praise, even if considered only in the light of those standards most commonly accepted in the present days.

---

<sup>1</sup> Under the institution called "The Mita," every Indian, under fifty years of age and above eighteen, was compelled to do service in the mines, without more compensation than fifty cents a day. Each district had to furnish, according to its population, a certain number of *mitayos*, who were taken to the different mining localities, and were there distributed among the miners by the authorities. They had to leave their families, and to abandon at once all hope of freedom, or relief. Father Acosta, one of the most reliable and celebrated historians of South America, states that out of each five Indians, impressed in this way by the *Mita*, four invariably perished in the first year of their service. The fact is, and nobody can doubt its authenticity, that the *Mita* killed eight millions of Indians in Peru alone. Viceroy Marquis of Cañete, in the preface of his ordinance to regulate the work at the mines, states that these unfortunate creatures were often compelled "to work the twenty-four hours, without eating or sleeping,"—and Viceroy Don Luis Velasco, his successor, directed the mining work to be made "from sunrise to sunset," *de sol à sol*, "with two hours of rest between both limits."

<sup>2</sup> The *Repartimientos* were the distributions of Indians among the Spanish colonists and settlers, for the cultivation of their lands, the working of their mines, or even their simple domestic service. They were another form of slavery, against which the religious orders, especially the Dominicans, struggled unrelentingly and uncompromisingly.

<sup>3</sup> Many instances are recorded in the history of those days in America of Indians refusing baptism for the express purpose of avoiding going to heaven, lest they might again meet with their heartless oppressors. (See Father Coll's *Colon and La Rabida*, page 294).



Will the quadri-centennial celebrations of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus pay, in the proper measure and with the magnificence becoming to its magnitude, the debt of gratitude which America owes to the monastic orders? Will they give the place of honor which is due to them, to those humble Franciscans, who established the first school in America; or to those learned Dominicans, who established Universities and centres of learning wherever they went, and who, better than that, never hesitated to raise their voices against despotic governors and heartless conquerors, and to defend the oppressed natives, without a particle of fear, and without admitting truce or compromise; or to those skillful physicians, sons of St. John of God, who studied medicine and founded hospitals, and attended the sick gratuitously, and restored to the dignity of the ministerial or sacerdotal character which belongs to it a profession which among the Romans was exercised by slaves, and which now, here, in the midst of so much boasted progress, is little less in many cases than a mere mercenary trade; or to those Mathurin Fathers, through whose action in the latter part of the last century, as has been said, so many American citizens were restored to liberty?

Jubilees and periodical celebrations of events of recognized importance, are not modern inventions. Man and his concerns are so ephemeral, and the necessity for him to pay a hearty tribute of thanksgiving for all that involves the idea of preservation, is so clearly impressed on his mind, that festivities of this kind have always been in use. And if, recently, the said festivities, centennials especially, have become fashionable, and so frequent indeed as to render their enumeration difficult, no well-disposed mind can be brought to object to them.

Much less objection could, under any circumstances, be made to the present Columbian celebrations, because of the immense importance of the event for the commemoration of which they are intended. Although Columbus never dreamed of the existence of the New World which he discovered, and although he never intended anything else than to find a new route to the East Indies, which was the great commercial problem of his age, especially after Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks in 1453, there is not the slightest doubt that the discovery of America marked an entirely new era in the life of the human race, and has to be considered, as most historians do consider it, the clearest and greatest landmark between the Middle Ages and what are called Modern Times.

Hence, when the prelate who now graces the arch-episcopal throne of Genoa informed our Holy Father the Pope that the authorities of that city,—one of the many which claim the honor

of being the native place of the illustrious discoverer, now exalted everywhere as an immortal genius, but when living and when offering his services to the proud republic, looked upon as no more than a "sailor in rags who promised worlds," *nudo nocchier promettitor di mondi*,—had come to the conclusion of celebrating with unusual pomp the four hundredth anniversary of the landing of Columbus in the New World, the answer of Leo XIII., approving of the project and giving to it his sanction, was prompt and emphatic.

Our great Pontiff said in his reply, January 10, 1891, that the idea of making the said celebration was in all respects worthy of praise, but that particular care should be taken to cause the festivities to be perfectly in keeping with the character of Columbus and with the genuine spirit which animated him.

Columbus, above all, was a fervent, sincere Catholic. He was a member of the third order of St. Francis, and, according to the testimony of Bartolomé de las Casas, who knew him personally, "he frequently walked about dressed as a Capuchin." Anything, therefore, which might be said or done in his honor, if inconsistent with that religious spirit or at variance with it, would be entirely inappropriate.

"Whosoever should look," says the Holy Father, "only to the material consequences of the discoveries of Columbus and to their temporal results, and pay them no more honors than those to be bestowed upon things which have nothing to do with Catholic faith, or are brilliant for no other reason than the genius or the perseverance of those who carried them to success, would do great injustice to the name and to the memory of the illustrious navigator. . . . We hope that this solemnity, as well as the example of Columbus himself, will prove instrumental in inflaming the minds of great numbers of people, and inducing them to make efforts to extend upon earth the kingdom of Christ."

Even without the authority of this explicit declaration of the Holy Father, the assertion can be made confidently that a celebration of the discovery of America, and a display or exhibit of American civilization, in which the work of the Catholic Church does not appear prominently represented and towering supreme above all other elements of social life, would be sadly defective and unworthy of the occasion. And if, as witnessed by the words of the Pope, no commemoration of Columbus and of his deeds can ever approach completion or truth, if the Church and her action and her influence are not made the principal feature of the festivities with which it will be solemnized, their inadequacy and deficiency will be still greater if the religious orders—those monks and friars, now so despised and persecuted wherever the Spanish

language is spoken and the so-called "liberal spirit" prevails—are not given the very first place of honor.

No student of history or lover of the human race, no matter what prejudices he may have imbibed against Catholic institutions and ideas, can fail to recognize the immense courage, the incredible self-denial and the beneficial action in America of that noble democratic militia of the Church, which so tirelessly and so unrelentingly interposed itself at all times between the oppressed natives and their heartless oppressors, and which did so much, and so bravely and so persistently, for the education and the welfare of the people among whom it was thrown. The history of the work of those friars in the New World, principally the Franciscans and the Dominicans, has not been written as yet, probably because it requires, besides the gifts of a Montalembert, a Chateaubriand, or a Joseph de Maistre, additional qualifications of thorough acquaintance with local facts, but, when written, it will be, we venture to say it, without the slightest hesitation, the greatest and the noblest monument which can ever be raised in honor of mankind.

From the very first days of the arrival of Columbus in the New World,<sup>1</sup> up to the period in the present century in which at the hypocritical cries of "reform and liberty," "equality and fraternity," the religious orders were swept away, as if by a furious hurricane, from the soil of Spain and Spanish America, in all about three centuries and a half,—monastic institutions and monastic influence formed in the Spanish empire, on both sides of the Atlantic, the broadest and perhaps the firmest and most substantial basis of the social structure.

---

<sup>1</sup> Father José Coll, a learned member of the order of St. Francis, maintains, in an interesting book just published at Madrid under the title of *Colón y la Rabida* (Columbus and La Rabida), that Columbus was accompanied in his first voyage by Franciscan fathers.

He also maintains, and seems to have proved beyond doubt, that Father Bernard Boil, or Boyle, or Buil, whom Pope Alexander VI., on June 25, 1493, appointed Vicar Apostolic of the Western Indies, was not a Benedictine, as generally believed, but a Franciscan friar. And he shows also by documents and arguments which admit of no contradiction, that Father Antonio Marchena, of the same Franciscan order, and two Franciscan lay brothers named Fr. Juan de la Duella, or Deledeulle, a Frenchman by birth, and Fr. Juan de Tisin, accompanied Columbus and Father Boyle and eight other Franciscan friars in his second voyage.

It is curious to see how historians and writers have succeeded in turning into one and the same person, under the name of Fray Juan Perez de Marchena, two entirely different individuals, Fray Juan Perez, the Superior of La Rabida, and Fray Antonio Marchena, a learned Franciscan, conversant with astronomy, both friends of Columbus.

Nor is it less interesting to contemplate how many efforts have been made to create two Fathers Boyle, one a Benedictine and another a Franciscan, when the words of the papal commission, *dilecto filio Bernardo Boil, Ordinis Minorum*, ought to have settled the question.



Those friars, so often represented in our days, in the countries of Spanish origin, as an obstacle to progress, as the most earnest advocates of ignorance and abject submission, as the worst enemies of the people, have been nevertheless the first, in the order of time, and the most assiduous, if not the only ones, in all periods of history, in the work of educating the masses, of promoting science and literature, of struggling against unscrupulous governors and tyrants of all kinds and grades, of conquering oppression and of vindicating the rights of justice and liberty.

The fact cannot be denied, for instance, that the very first school,—a primary gratuitous school,—ever opened on the soil of the New World, was opened by a Franciscan friar, Fray Pedro de Sante, or, as others call him, de Sanda, who was a relative of Emperor Charles V., and had accompanied Cortés in his expedition to Mexico. He and Fray Juan de Tecto, and Fray Juan de Ayora, belonging also to the Seraphic order, were the first ecclesiastics, who ever set their feet on the Mexican territory.

In a letter written by Fray Pedro de Sante, to the Emperor, in 1523, he said: "I have undertaken to teach the children to read and write, and also to sing, . . . and in order to do so, a school house has been built on the grounds surrounding our house, with sufficient capacity to accommodate from five hundred to six hundred children, who meet there daily."

Eight years afterwards (1531) that very same friar established another school for girls of noble birth, whether natives (*de caciques*) or of mixed race.

He also, aided no doubt by his companions, established a hospital, an account of which he gave to the Emperor in the following words: "Near our house an infirmary has been founded for the benefit of the natives, . . . and this is of great assistance to us for their conversion to the Faith, because they see the charity which Christians are capable of practising, and are therefore incited to be converted, and to love us and talk with us."

Not contenting himself with teaching the ignorant, and attending the sick, he never suffered any opportunity to pass without urging the Emperor to apply a remedy to the evils which afflicted the natives, who were treated, as he said, "worse than if they were dogs." "For the love of God," he says in one of his letters, "may your Majesty be pleased to provide, that no one of these natives be reduced to slavery by any person, of whatever rank or condition. Command that this slavery cease, and that these people be allowed to be Christians; because even on Christmas day they are compelled to work."

Several years later the same friar wrote: "I have worked with the Indians day and night for more than thirty years, and I have

been with them constantly in a school near this chapel (St. Joseph, the first church ever built in Mexico), and I have taught them to sing and to play on some instrument, and to read and write, and the Christian doctrine, and I have always had them at my charge, and have taken particular care of them."

And this venerable and humble Franciscan friar, educator, benefactor and tribune, is no more than a prominent specimen of what all his colaborers as well of his own order, as of the other orders, always did in America. They were the only representatives in the new countries of the idea of justice, and appeared in all respects as the principal factors in the moral, intellectual, and social development of the aborigines.

When describing the work of destruction which Spain allowed to go on at the convent of La Rábida, so intimately connected with Columbus and the discovery of America, the Rev. Father Coll, who has been mentioned before, alludes to a palm tree, which now stands alone on these grounds, once so celebrated for their beauty and magnificence,<sup>1</sup> but now barren and deserted. He says that that tall tree, the only extant monument of a glory past beyond hope and beyond recovery, soars up to heaven, as if in search of a purer air, or as if anxious to refuse the sweetness of its fruits to the ingratitude of men. In imitation of this beautiful figure, and even at the risk of repetition, because the truth can never be repeated too often, the assertion can be made and reiterated confidently, that nothing to be done either at Genoa, or at Madrid, Chicago, or elsewhere, can properly illustrate the history of the civilization of Spanish America, if a monument towering above the other monuments of the exhibition, even as the palm tree of La Rábida towers above the desert which now surrounds it, is not raised in commemoration of the religious orders, in recognition of their services, and in expiation of the grave crimes which have been committed against them.

Few indications can be found, however, in these days of the "secularization" of all things (marriage included), that such a tribute of respect, no matter how just and due, will be paid. The probabilities are, on the contrary, that the friars will never once be mentioned in connection with Columbus and the civilization of the New World, without applying to them, as the most natural of

---

<sup>1</sup> "It is a shame to think of what has passed at La Rábida during the last half century. When the Franciscan fathers were forced to leave it, under the laws which suppressed the monastic orders, and expelled their members, the convent and the Church of La Rábida were allowed to be plundered. The archives and the library were pillaged. The tiles and the timber of the roof, the doors and the windows, even the bricks of the partitions and pavements, were torn down and carried away. The extensive orchards, and all the robust and splendid trees, which surrounded the convent, were made to disappear."—*Colon y la Rábida*, pp. 66, 67.

epithets, the adjective "superstitious," or without making against them the unfounded charges which brought upon them obloquy and persecution. It will not be surprising if some enraged "liberal," imitating the Yucatan orator who proclaimed in the Mexican Congress that "the smoke of the convent fire-places obscures the sun of liberty," may come and display his bitter opposition to the religious orders;—nor will it be impossible, either, that other statesmen, deeming themselves to abound in benevolence and impartiality, may adopt a middle course and maintain that friars and convents, although a thing of the past, inconsistent with the enlightenment of our times, had nevertheless their day, in which they did some good.

Not many years ago (1885) a book, which owing to the especial circumstances in which its author happened then to be found, obtained an immense circulation (in this country at least), described the venerable members of the religious orders in the following language: "The humble monk, with bowed head enveloped in sombre cowl, his scanty gown dyed and stiffened by reason of his abstinence from the sinful luxury of ablution; his body girt with a heavy rope, by way of showing that the beast was well in hand . . . monastic aristocrats . . . bound together by voluntary obedience to a set of rules involving renunciation of the world . . . seeking to expiate former action by present lethargy, striving toward actual paralysis of all faculties which can connect the individual with the society."<sup>1</sup>

If such a sturdy calumny as this can be uttered without the slightest provocation or foundation by a member of what the world has agreed to call the gentler sex, and in a country like this where the risk of endangering the Catholic vote is so keenly felt, and where full liberty of conscience and of expression allows truth to assert itself without difficulty, what shall we not hear from Freemasons of the 33d degree, either here or in Europe, or from other "unprejudiced and liberal-minded statesmen" on both sides of the Atlantic, in opposition to the idea of making Catholic monasticism the most prominent and the most honored feature of all festivities in commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the landing of Columbus in the New World?

It is unnecessary for the readers of this paper to be reminded of the severe and cruel persecution to which the religious houses have been subjected in Spain and all the countries of Spanish origin ever since 1837. That very same convent of La Rabida, a fac simile of which is to be built at Chicago on the grounds of the Columbian World's Fair, that convent which Spain ought to have

---

<sup>1</sup> George Elliot's *Poetry and Other Studies*, by Rose Elizabeth Cleveland, New York—London, 1886. Essay entitled "The Monastery," pp. 129, 130.



preserved for all time as a superb monument of national glory, only escaped demolition by a bold act of disobedience on the part of the local governor of Huelva. This official took upon himself not to comply with the royal order of August 5, 1851, by which he was directed to pull down the building and sell the material, and was bold enough to remonstrate against the royal commandment. "If we hurry so much," said that brave official in his representation to the government of Madrid, "in demolishing and obliterating these landmarks of our history, public opinion and history herself will take cognizance of our acts and deliver them justly to the reprobation of both foreigners and Spaniards."<sup>1</sup>

This noble deed, supplemented by the timely arrival upon the spot of a French prince, the Duke of Montpensier, with his wife, the queen's sister, and with his mother, the widow of Louis Philippe of France, saved the famous house. The illustrious visitors started a subscription for the restoration of these venerable ruins, which they could not view without emotion; and their success was so complete, that on the 15th of April, 1855, they could attend in that church the solemn high mass with which the restoration was solemnized.

But apart from the persecutions, which have been frequent, the fact will remain, that while the name of Columbus will be hailed and extolled in all possible tones—a little too late, perhaps—and while the magnitude and far-reaching importance of his achievement will be lauded and proclaimed in divers ways, little will be said, and that little possibly disparagingly, of the fraternal society of Saint Francis, to the Third Order of which the great navigator belonged, and that the Dominicans will be mentioned, only, if mentioned at all, as apostles of intolerance and religious persecution. Jews, Freemasons and freethinkers, who now prevail in the councils of government in the so-called Latin nations of the world, have no sympathy, undoubtedly, with the spirit and the work of the religious orders.

We may be sure that we shall listen to a great number of passionate outbursts of rhetoric, and contemplate not a small display of self-glorification, ill disguised under the name of patriotism, and intended to make up for centuries of oblivion and ingratitude; but while wealth and power and all the creations of science and art, and all the elements of material civilization will be called into requisition to make this somewhat tardy recognition brilliant, the humble men who encouraged the great sailor, and were so efficiently instrumental in the work he accomplished for the glory of God and the benefit of mankind, and who afterwards opened schools, and founded universities, and established hospitals, and

---

<sup>1</sup> *Colon and La Rabida*, p. 71.

heroically defended the natives, and indelibly impressed their religious character on the civilization of Spanish America, will be either forgotten entirely or given a place in accordance with the anti-religious spirit which is now prevailing.

Were it not for these circumstances and others which are nearly related to them, it would be scarcely comprehensible that the really hearty and spontaneous<sup>1</sup> commemoration of the discovery of the New World should be made in these United States, the American nation which, least of all, has had immediate relations with Columbus and his voyages, and which has had the least share in the ideas and principles which actuated the illustrious Genoese, a nation in which the Spanish element has ever been comparatively insignificant, and where Catholicity, although flourishing and always on the increase, is still in the minority.

The sons of St. Francis of Assisi were the first ecclesiastics who came to the New World. According to the "General Chronicle of the Order of Our Father St. Francis" (*Chronica general de la Orden de Nuestro Padre San Francisco*), "Seraphic Tree" (*Arbol Seráfico*), printed in Barcelona in 1703, the work of Father Gonzaga, "*De origine Seraphica Religionis Franciscanæ*," the "True Treasures of the Indies" (*Tesoros verdaderos de las Indias*), printed in Rome in 1681, and many other authorities quoted by Father Coll, Franciscan friars came with Columbus when (these are the *ipsissima verba* of the "Chronicle")<sup>2</sup> "Columbus embarked on the 3d of August, 1492." But even if, as contended by some, no ecclesiastic, whether regular or secular, came with him on his first voyage, no doubt can be entertained that ecclesiastics accompanied him on the second, and that the Franciscans were the first who exercised in the West Indies the functions of the Apostolate, the first who built a church in the New World<sup>3</sup> and had a con-

<sup>1</sup> Father Coll, who wrote in 1891, while acknowledging that "the Spanish government had an ocean of projects for the celebration of the quadri-centennial," . . . complains that "three long years had been allowed to pass without having reached as yet any practical result" He says: "We are told day after day that these projects will be carried out; but we know well enough how much reliance is to be put on words, and until we see them substantiated by subsequent facts, we shall be unable to bestow much credence upon them."—*Colón y la Rábida*, page 82.

<sup>2</sup> Father Coll, *Colón y la Rábida*, page 220.

<sup>3</sup> "Soon after Columbus had taken possession of the island (Santo Domingo, or La Española), Fray Juan Perez, who came with Columbus and had done so much in furtherance of his projects, and was the first priest who arrived here (*Joannes Piretius primo in istam insulam ingressus*), built a cabin, which he roofed with branches of trees, where he said Mass and deposited the Blessed Sacrament; hence this was the first church built in the Western Indies: *et hæc prima Occidentalium omnium Indiarum ecclesia est*."—*Crónica General de la Orden*, etc. Father Coll, *Colón y la Rábida*, pp. 220, 236, etc.

vent,<sup>1</sup> and a duly constituted province,<sup>2</sup> and that the first Bishop on this side of the Atlantic belonged to their order.<sup>3</sup>

The popularity of the sons of Saint Francis in the newly-discovered countries grew to such an extent and with such rapidity as to cause the Catholic kings, in spite of their piety, and of the general feeling of the period, to put some check to it. King Ferdinand, in 1506, issued a decree by which he forbade any new convent of St. Francis to be established in America, unless at a distance of at least five leagues (fifteen miles) from one already in existence.

The charge has often been ignorantly made against the Franciscan friars of having done nothing, or very little, in favor of science and intellectual development. No better answer could be given to this slander than by pointing to a book, printed in Tuscany, in the city of Prado, in 1888, under the title of "An Attempt towards a Franciscan Bibliography on Geographical, Historical and Ethnographical Subjects" (*Saggio di bibliografia geografica, storica, etnografica San Francescana*), by Father Marcellino da Civezza, of the same order. This admirable book is a catalogue, by order of authors, of all the writings on Geography, History and Ethnography, whose authors were Franciscan friars, and consists of more than 624 pages<sup>4</sup> with over 750 names. They comprise books in Spanish, French, Italian, Portuguese, English, German, Turkish, Latin, Greek, Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Siamese, and several languages of the American Indians<sup>5</sup>; and among them may be

<sup>1</sup> Columbus founded for the Franciscans their first convent in America, in the city of Santo Domingo, in 1493. Ovando completed it in 1502. *Cenobium autem . . . in civitate S. Dominici tumultuaria opera erectum, ac deinde à Christophero Columbo firmiori Europeorum structura inchoatum, Ovandus absolvit.* (Wadding, *Annals of the Order of Saint Francis*).—Father Coll, *Colón y la Rábida*, p. 240.

<sup>2</sup> The province of Santa Cruz, *Sanctæ Crucis in insulis*, was the name of this first religious province in the New World. It was created "on the eve of Pentecost, 1520," and Father Pedro de Mekia was the first provincial.—Father Coll, *Colón y la Rábida*, p. 258.

<sup>3</sup> The episcopal See of Santo Domingo was created on the 8th of August, 1611, and Fray Garcia de Padilla, a Franciscan, was appointed to fill it.

<sup>4</sup> The number of pages is not given definitely because the copy which the writer of this paper has seen, sent to Mr. Wm. E. Curtis of this city (Washington) by Rev. Father Anacleto, O.S.F., of Boston, Mass., reaches only the name *Vega* (Fray Manuel de la Vega) on page 624. Father Vega's name is 750 in the catalogue.

<sup>5</sup> There is a Spanish, Latin and Japanese Dictionary, by Fray Diego de Llagas,—a Japanese Grammar (in Spanish), by Father Rodriguez,—a Chinese and Spanish Dictionary, by Fray Miguel Rocca—a Spanish, Latin and Arabic Dictionary, by Fray Francisco Cañat (edition of Madrid in 3 vols., 1787),—a Turkish Italian and Italian Turkish Dictionary, by Fray Arcangelo de Carradori, 1650,—a Chinese, French and Latin Dictionary, by Father Barile de Gemoni, Paris, 1813,—a Spanish Siamese Dictionary, by Fray Francisco Hermona de San Buenaventura,—a Spanish Anamese Dictionary, by the same author,—a Dictionary of the Mexican language, by Fray Francisco de Salcedo,—a Dictionary of the language of Yucatan, by Fray Andres de



seen the famous letter of Fray Pedro de Ganda, or Gante, from San Francisco of Mexico, February 15, 1552, to the Emperor Charles V, "denouncing the lamentable condition to which the Indians had been reduced on account of the personal services required from them;" the not less remarkable communication of Fray Juan de Mansilla to King Phillip II, "making his majesty acquainted with the abuses which prevailed in Vera Cruz, and suggesting some remedy to the same," dated at Xalapa, May 24, 1562; the invaluable "Report submitted by Fray Carlos Delgado to Rev. Father Ximeno on the execrable tyranny exercised by the governors and *alcaldes mayores* against the Indians;" a manuscript in folio, now in the Royal Library at Madrid; the "Advertencias importantes" (Important Suggestions) of Fray Juan de Silva, addressed "to His Majesty and to the Council of the Indies, in 1631"; and many other books and pamphlets which will show that those humble servants of God had very much at heart the welfare of the people, and did not hesitate to raise their voices in their defence and in earnest condemnation of their oppressors of whatever rank or position.

The very same difficulties which Columbus himself had to encounter on the part of Father Boyle, and the other Franciscans who wrote against him to the Spanish Court prove the zeal of those friars on behalf of the people. Columbus, with all his merits, and with all his virtues, was no more than a man, and a man who did not shun doing some things which the sons of Saint Francis could in no manner approve or countenance. He claimed that, owing to his extraordinary position, his acts could not be judged in the same light and by the same standard of justice as those of the rest of men.<sup>1</sup> And when he displayed so much severity in punishing sedition, or reduced the natives to slavery and made gifts of those unfortunate creatures to his friends or admirers,<sup>2</sup> no true servant

---

Avendano,—a Grand Dictionary of the Maya language of Yucatan, by Fray Antonio de Ciudad Real.—a Chilean Spanish and Spanish Chilean Dictionary, by Fray Antonio Hernandez Calzada,—a translation of the Gospels in the Tarasco language of Mexico, etc.

<sup>1</sup> In a letter addressed by Columbus to Doña Juana de la Torre, he said: "I must be judged, not as a governor sent to a province the government of which is regularly administered, and in which the laws in existence can be enforced, but as a Captain, conqueror of a warlike nation, different from us in religion and habits, and whose members live scattered through the forests, or sheltered in the mountains."

<sup>2</sup> Columbus made a present of three hundred Indians to some friends of his who had assisted him in the fitting out of the vessels which brought him to the New World. These unfortunate beings were carried to Spain as slaves. As soon as Queen Isabella heard of this strange gift, she exclaimed with indignation: "*With what right does Columbus dispose of my subjects? Who has given him authority to show his liberality in this way?*" And she ordered at once under penalty of death, that the 300 Indians and all others who might then be found in Spain should be immediately restored to liberty.

of Christ could in conscience fail to disapprove of it. Religious orders are too near to God on the one side and too near the masses of the people on the other, to admit of a compromise or temporization with tyranny.

Much has been said and written in condemnation, not only of Father Boyle, but also of the four Franciscan friars, who came with Bobadilla in 1500, and wrote those famous letters in which Columbus is alluded to as Pharaoh, and in which it was requested that no man from Genoa should ever be allowed to come to the New World. But the very bitterness and earnestness of their condemnation of the state of things which they found at La Española, is the best and the most conclusive proof of the zeal of those Fathers for justice, of their abhorrence of tyranny, no matter by whom it was exercised, or for what reasons it was resorted to, and of their love towards the people whom they were sent to Christianize. They were missionaries, apostles, evangelizers, not government functionaries or agents and assistants of the temporal rulers and abettors of their excesses.

A striking proof of this commendable spirit can be found in the letter which Fray Antonio de Toledo wrote from Santiago de Cuba, on November 12, 1534, to Emperor Charles V., explaining why he had refused to accompany Manuel de Rojas, the governor of the island, to a certain distribution of Indians which had taken place in those days in Bayamo. "I excused myself," says the Franciscan friar, "from going with governor Manuel de Rojas to the city of Bayamo in order to be present at a distribution of Indians, for the simple reason that our rule forbids us such business. *No par otra razon sino porque nuestra regla nos prohibe estas negociaciones.*"

Bobadilla brought with him to Santo Domingo, or La Española, in 1500, four Franciscan friars,<sup>1</sup> and in 1502, when Ovando landed at this island, he came accompanied by thirteen members of the same religious order.<sup>2</sup> Subsequently they began to come so frequently, and in such numbers, and spread themselves so widely through the islands and about the continent, that as has been stated, the number of their houses, at such an early period as 1506, attracted the attention of King Ferdinand and induced him to take measures to restrict their increase. Whether it was because of

---

<sup>1</sup> These friars were Fray Francisco Ruiz, Fray Juan Trasierra, Fray Juan Deledeulle, and Fray Juan de Robles.

<sup>2</sup> They were Fray Alonzo del Espinar, Fray Bartolome Ternegano, Fray Antonio de Carrion, Fray Francisco de Portugal, Fray Antonio de los Martires, Fray Moseo de Zafra, Fray Pedro and Fray Alonso de Hornachuelos, Fray Bartolomé de Sevilla, Fray Juan de la Ninojosa, Fray Juan de Escalante, Fray Juan and Fray Pedro, or Pierre, called the Frenchmen on account of their nationality.

some feature of the Seraphic order, which rendered it peculiarly attractive to the people among whom it worked with so much zeal and self-denial,<sup>1</sup> or because of the opinion, more or less firmly rooted in all the sons of St. Francis, that the privilege of the Christianization and civilization of America belonged to them, exclusively,—the fact is that their convents, some of them magnificent specimens of architectural skill, some others simple houses of more or less modest appearance, can be found everywhere upon the soil of the New World, strewn like precious jewels all over its surface. Few of those buildings are now devoted to the purposes for which they were erected; whilst the desecrated majority still remain, protesting with mute eloquence against the folly and ingratitude of men.

It is well known, that in the year 1494, while Columbus was cruising along the southern coast of the island of Cuba, he caused his people to land at a convenient spot near the mouth of the Iatibonico River, and had the holy sacrifice of the Mass offered up there,—for the first time in the island,—on the 6th of July.<sup>2</sup> It is also well known that when Diego Velazquez came afterwards, with his three hundred followers, to settle in Cuba (1511), one of his companions was the afterwards celebrated Apostle of the Indies, Fray Bartolomé de las Casas, who had already entered the order of St. Dominic. But we have no record of the exact date on which the sons of St. Francis set their feet for the first time on the privileged shores of the Queen of the Antilles. There is abundant proof, however, that in 1532, there was already a convent of that order in the city of Santiago de Cuba; and that both in that convent and in all others subsequently established, the indefatigable inmates consecrated themselves wholly to the defense of the people, the alleviation of their sufferings, the enlightenment of their minds, and the redemption of their souls from vice.

We have seen already, how and for what reason Fray Antonio de Toledo had refused in 1534, to accompany Governor de Rojas on his trip to Bayamo. And we shall have only to glance at the records of those days in Cuba, to find everywhere the most abund-

---

<sup>1</sup> The extreme degree of poverty to which these venerable friars were reduced, is shown by a letter of Fray Diego Sarmiento, then the Bishop of Cuba, dated at Bayamo, April 20, 1556, in which he describes "the calamities and miseries which had befallen the island," and says: "sometimes we have been unable to say Mass, because we had no wine." *Ha faltado el sacrificio de la misa algunas veces, por falta de vino.*

<sup>2</sup> The first Mass in Havana was said in 1519. This event is commemorated by a monument called *El Templete* (the little temple) raised on the spot. The exact date has never been ascertained.

The first mass in Central America was said at Caxina, now Truxillo, Honduras, on Sunday the 14th of August, 1502, and was attended by Columbus.



ant testimony of the beneficent and civilizing influence of the friars.

The Spanish conquerors of Cuba, and those who afterwards came to settle in the country, were for the most part exceedingly rude and ignorant. The records of the city councils abundantly testify that aldermen, and many other people of social prominence or standing, were unable to write their names; that the friars "taught the people gratuitously how to read and write, and instructed them in the Christian doctrine and in arithmetic, and in serving Mass, and inspired in them the holy love and fear of God, and respect and obedience to their parents, and imparted to them the knowledge of all virtues, principally humility, which is like the foundation and basis of the spiritual building"; and that they, as a Spanish writer of our days aptly puts it, "dispelled that very darkness which ignorance has charged them with having fostered and endeavored to preserve."

The Franciscan convents of the island of Cuba, so far as the knowledge of the writer goes, were eight: one at Santiago de Cuba, which was the first, founded sometime before 1534; another at Havana, established in 1574; a third at Bayamo, founded in 1582; the fourth at Puerto Principe, established in 1599; a fifth at Trinidad, founded in 1713; the sixth at Santo Espiritu, established in 1716; the seventh at Guanabacoa founded in 1722; and the eighth at Villa Clara, or Santa Clara, established in 1730.

The Convent of St. Francis, at Santiago de Cuba, had very humble beginnings. Governor Manuel de Rojas, in a letter addressed by him to the emperor, dated February 27, 1535, says: "In this monastery there are only six or seven friars, and the oldest of them is a man thirty years of age. We should like to have four more sent here, and among them some one of more authority." And Fray Francisco de Avila, the head of the convent, in a letter which he wrote to the emperor, on July 8, 1532, says: "I came here, on the 6th of November, 1531, in company with Vadillo and another friar of my order. He and I came by order of our provincial at Santo Domingo de la Española. The city council here gave us, with much pleasure, the ground on which the monastery is to be erected, as your majesty commanded. Up to the present we have only built the church and one thatch-roofed house, which we, the four of our order who are now here, have chosen for our residence."

But not many years were required to change this state of things. That thatched-roofed house of 1531 soon became one of the most imposing buildings of the city, with many rooms and spacious cloisters and courts.<sup>1</sup> In 1841 the government, in pursuance of

<sup>1</sup> The church has three spacious naves and a front of elegant architecture. Admittance to the church is obtained, in this front part, through three large doors.

the decree of suppression of the religious orders and confiscation of their property, took possession of this convent,<sup>1</sup> and destined it to be used for a barrack. As such it is still used for the forces of artillery and infantry which garrison the city. As if nature itself wished to join in the protest which must be raised at all times against such acts of spoliation, an earthquake in 1852 caused the tower of the church to fall down. No attempt has been made ever since to rebuild it.

The Convent of Havana, the second of the order in Cuba, was a magnificent edifice. A slab, which can still be seen above the central door of the front part of the church, contained the following inscription: *Non est in toto sanctior orbe locus*. Nevertheless, the Spanish government has been using that church, ever since 1854, as a magazine for the custom-house. The convent itself, where St. Francis Solanus occupied a room, embraces an area perhaps twice as large as the treasury of the United States in Washington city. It was turned over to the civil authorities to be used for the custody of all kinds of old documents and papers (*Archivo General de la isla*), and for the accommodation of many officials who are furnished there by the government with commodious lodgings.

This noble building, which is considered the best of its class on the island, is admirably situated upon the very shore of the bay of Havana. The church, annexed to it and at present desecrated, as we have said, has a vaulted stone roof, supported by two parallel rows of substantial columns, forming three spacious naves. The middle one is about 222 feet long by 32 feet wide, while the two lateral naves measure about 177 feet in length and 14 feet in width. The ceiling of the church is very high, and the tower, which is the highest monument built in Cuba, is crowned by a statue of St. Helene.

According to an historian of the last century, there were always in that house from seventy to eighty friars, who occupied themselves, besides performing their religious duties, in the teaching of Latin, theology, philosophy and other branches. This teaching was always gratuitous, and regularly and systematically imparted. The Franciscan fathers of Havana had a regular *maestro* of grammar, a *lector* on philosophy, three professors or tutors (*catedráticos*) of the same science, or rather of some special branches thereof, and teachers of other sciences, mathematics included; and this teaching department of the convent, frequented by a great number of pupils, and imparting education gratuitously (as has been stated and ought to be constantly called to the attention of all

<sup>1</sup> When the convent was taken possession of by the civil authorities in 1841, it was inhabited by twelve friars ordained *in sacris*, and by a number of lay brothers.

those who have interest in educational matters), was under the control and supervision of a prefect of studies, called the *Regente General de Estudios*.

At the earnest request of the citizens of Havana, authority was given to this convent to confer the degree of bachelor both in philosophy and theology; and the studies made there were granted the same official character and validity as those made in any regularly authorized educational establishment of the Spanish monarchy.

As has been stated elsewhere, St. Francis Solano, before going to Peru, where he died, had been one of the inmates of this historical house, and his room was kept for a long time and shown to visitors as a very interesting curiosity.

The storm of "reform" has swept away all that could be removed from this venerable institution which gave to Cuba many men of high rank in science as well as in virtue; but the social structure of the country does not seem to have derived, as yet, the benefit which was expected from the "liberal" measures which scattered to the four winds both the fathers themselves and their property, without sparing their library or even the statues of the saints and other ornaments of the church.<sup>1</sup>

The convent of Bayamo, founded by Fray Francisco Adan, with donations in money and materials of all kind which he secured from the citizens of that locality,<sup>2</sup> can claim the glory of having been the first educational establishment in the island of Cuba. Captain Francisco de Parada made, in 1571, a donation of seventy thousand dollars for the establishment and support of a free primary school, which was entrusted to the Franciscans and attained a great success. The building of this convent is now occupied by some offices of the government.

The convent of Puerto Principe, which belongs also to the sixteenth century—the first century of Cuban history,—was founded by Fray Francisco Amado with funds supplied in part by Diego Sifontes in 1587, and by many other persons, whose names were more or less conspicuously recorded upon the walls of the Church. The old records show that in the immediate neighborhood of this convent there were no more than 180 houses, all of them inhabited by poor people. This convent has the glory of having had among its most active members, the celebrated Father Fray

---

<sup>1</sup> The writer of the present paper remembers well, although these events took place in the days of his boyhood, the scandal caused in Havana by the breaking and sale for fuel of the statues of the saints, altars, ornaments, etc., of the church of St. Francis.

<sup>2</sup> All the lime used for the construction of this building was supplied gratuitously by Captain Alonso, one of the citizens of Bayamo.



José de la Cruz Espí, also called Father Valencia, from the place of his birth, still remembered as one of the greatest benefactors of Puerto Principe and its district, and held by popular opinion, even when he was living, to be a Saint. This noble Franciscan who died on May 2, 1838, was highly instrumental in the founding of many great works of charity, and especially the Orphan Asylum (*Casa de Beneficencia*) of Puerto Principe, in which all the poor girls of the city could find shelter and education.<sup>1</sup> When the establishments of beneficence became civil institutions, and the government took charge of this asylum, the first thing which was done was to sell the building. The records of the time show that the government received \$15,084.62½, as proceeds of that sale; but they fail to give any account of the subsequent disposition of the money, much less can it be shown that it was used in any way for the benefit of the poor, unless it were under the theory, often heard in the mouth of some patriotic Spanish statesmen, that the state itself is the first pauper to be relieved.

The convents of Saint Francis, at Trinidad and Santo Espiritu, which are two cities not very far distant from each other, were comparatively small houses. The former never had more than six or seven inmates, whether priests or lay brothers, while the latter, in the days of its greatest prosperity, had only nine friars ordained *in sacris*, and three lay brothers. The convent of Trinidad was built exclusively at the expense of Don Gerónimo de Fuentes and his wife, residents of that city; and the convent of Santo Espiritu by contributions of all kinds from many people.

The great convent of Saint Francis of Guanabacoa, now occupied by the sons of St. Joseph Calasanctius, and used by them as a first class educational establishment, with a certain degree of official authority, as far as the validity of the studies and the degree of Bachelor of arts, or sciences, is concerned, was founded in the early part of the eighteenth century "to aid the Church in satisfying the spiritual needs of the people, and attending to the education of the youth." This house, always spoken of by the historians of the country as a "centre of learning as well as of all virtues" (*depósito de la sabiduría y de todas las virtudes*), magnificently built, with extensive gardens and orchards attached to it, and of course a very handsome church, was from the beginning a regular primary school, for all people, rich or poor, white or colored, and never failed to excite, besides great reverence, profound sympathy and gratitude. The government did not dare to close it, but decided to keep it as a kind of refuge for the members of the order, expelled from the other convents, who were unable

---

<sup>1</sup> A gentleman of Puerto Principe named Don Lorenzo de Mirando y Agniteria, contributed for this purpose \$22,000.

either from age, or other circumstances (there were two insane in their number), to take care of themselves.

As to the convent of St. Francis in Villa Clara, or Santa Clara, which was the last one of this order founded in Cuba, whatever may be said in its praise scarcely shall meet the requirements of strict justice. It was founded at the request, and by the earnest efforts of Father Juan de Conyedo, a secular priest and benefactor, whose name is associated with the progress and welfare of that city, in which his memory is still kept in the highest veneration,<sup>1</sup> and was used partly as a hospital, and partly as a primary school under the name of "School of Our Lady of Sorrows," independently of the classes of Latin, Philosophy, and other branches, which were open free of cost to all those who cared to attend them.

When this convent and the Church attached to it were closed by the government in 1841, the authorities had to proceed in great haste to prevent any action on the part of the people. A well written and in all respects reliable history of Villa Clara<sup>2</sup> relates that the hurry of the authorities was such that "no more than one morning was needed to change completely the aspect of the temple, and remove to the storehouses of the government the five altars, the statues, ornaments, furniture, and everything else belonging to it." The whole building, convent and church together, has been used ever since 1849 as a barrack for the troops.

If the history of the sons of St. Francis of Assisi in the New World is as admirable and grand as has been more or less imperfectly outlined in the preceding pages, it does not eclipse, however, in the slightest manner, the brilliant career of the Dominicans.

They came to Santo Domingo, or La Española, if not as early as the Franciscans, at least early enough to allow them, in 1511, to boldly espouse the cause of the natives and denounce the injustice and cruelty of their oppressors. Fray Antonio Montesino, of the order of Preachers, had one day ascended the chair of the Holy Ghost, during a religious festivity of great solemnity, in 1511, which was attended by the second Admiral of the Indies, the royal officers, and the most important personages of the city of Santo Domingo; and, as if inspired by the occasion, or moved by the desire to seize the opportunity, which presented itself to speak to all those officials together, he devoted his sermon to the most earnest condemnation of the cruelties perpetrated against the natives, and to a strenuous exhortation to his audience to change their plan of government and to respect justice and morality.

---

<sup>1</sup> Father Conyedo was a native of Cuba, born in 1687. He died in 1761.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoria histórica de la villa de Santa Clara y su jurisdicción*, por Manuel Dionisio Gonzalez. Villa Clara, 1858.

The words of the Dominican priest did not arouse in his listeners any other feeling than anger and a thirst for revenge; and as soon as the Mass was over, the principal authorities proceeded in a body to the house of his order and said to the Superior that if Father Montesino did not withdraw his remarks and express his regret for having uttered them, the whole order would be expelled from the island. The Superior replied, as related by Quintano,<sup>1</sup> that the opinions of Father Montesino were, indeed, the opinions of all his brethren, but that, in order to avoid scandal, he should recommend him to speak with more moderation in whatever sermon he might preach in the future. But either the Superior did not do anything of the kind, or Father Montesino thought it was unworthy of his ministry and of the chair of truth to temporize in any manner, through human respect, with error and iniquity. And so it was, that when he again ascended the pulpit and addressed an audience, made still larger by the expectation of enjoying the apologies to be made by the good friar, the latter raised his voice still louder, reaffirmed, word by word, all that he had said, rebuked the officials, and maintained that by his action he was doing, not only his duty as a minister of the Almighty, but rendering a service, and a most important one, to the king himself.

And when the enraged authorities sent to Madrid their complaints, and the Dominicans were compelled to defend themselves before the Court, they sent, as their representative there, the same Father Montesino; who pleaded so energetically, and demonstrated so clearly the injustice of the slavery to which the natives were subjected, and the iniquities which were perpetrated upon them, that the king ordered him and the other Dominicans to return to America, in order that "through the example of their virtues, and the influence of their good doctrine, the fruit which was desired, namely, the salvation of souls, could be reaped."

But neither this heroic advocate of justice, nor his brethren and associates in the island of Santo Domingo, not less heroic than he, were an exception to the rule. History has recorded, in characters which neither time nor sophistry can obliterate, all that was done in that line, in regard to Cuba and other possessions of the Spanish crown, by Fray Bartolomé de Las Casas, the illustrious apostle of the Indies, and by every member of the Dominican order, in favor of the oppressed natives. Moved by his charity and his love of justice, Father Las Casas crossed the Atlantic seventeen times, and went to plead personally, in favor of the people whose protection had been entrusted to him.<sup>2</sup> Four times he had to go to Germany, where the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Vidas de Españoles Célebres. Fray Bartolomé de las Casas.*

<sup>2</sup> Cardinal Jimenez Cisneros appointed Father Las Casas "Protector of the Indians," in 1516.



emperor happened to be, to meet him and present to him in person his arguments and his complaints. As fearless of persecution as of personal danger, he spoke the truth to the monarchs, defended it before the courts and councils, disputed with the learned, struggled with the powerful, and wrote immortal works, in the cause of outraged justice. Through his untiring efforts, the *Audiencias*<sup>1</sup> of America were established, and he himself accompanied to Santo Domingo the first court of this class organized for the New World.

The charge has been made—by those who think to be patriotic by compromising with injustice, or extenuating infamies, and trying to throw discredit on the acts of this great man—that his zeal in favor of the Indians was more in the nature of a hobby than in real hatred of slavery; and it has been said, and repeated, that owing to him and to his efforts African slavery was established in the New World. But the charge is false, as has been proved conclusively. When Father Las Casas wrote the memorial, upon which the whole structure of the charge rests, African slavery was already in existence in America. Chronology, with her inflexible finger, points at the respective dates, and contemptuously dismisses the imputation.

The order of St. Dominic, created in 1216, not to live in solitude and apart from the world, but “to be in constant and efficient contact with civil society, and to take charge of the study and propagation, through their apostolate, of the Divine science,” has had in America the great merit of having devoted itself entirely, not only to the defence of justice, but to the diffusion of learning in all its branches.

Superficial writers are always ready to refer to the Spanish Inquisition and make St. Dominic responsible, as well as the order he founded, for the blood and the sufferings which are charged to that Tribunal. The truth is that, as has been proved by Cantú and others, neither St. Dominic had any share at all in its establishment, nor was his order devised “to impose the faith, but to defend its liberty.” And so well established and recognized is this fact in Spain, that when the committee of the Cortes, which was appointed in 1812 to inquire into the advisability of suppressing the Tribunal of the Inquisition, made their report, which was accepted, in favor of the suppression, the explicit declaration was made that “St. Dominic did not use or advise to use other weapons against heresy than prayer, patience and instruction.”

---

<sup>1</sup> High Tribunals of Justice, with powers to interfere to a certain extent, and through certain forms of procedure, in the administration of the government. They often checked the tyranny of the Viceroys and Captain-Generals.

Be it as it may elsewhere, the fact is that neither in the island of Santo Domingo, nor in that of Cuba, the Dominican Fathers did more than to defend justice, educate the people and promote their happiness.

They came to Cuba, very few in number, from the neighboring island of Santo Domingo, in the early part of the sixteenth century. They were presided over by Fray Entierrez de Ampudia, who came as their superior, invested with the dignity of Vicar Apostolic for the whole island. When Pope Leo X. created the diocese of Cuba, in 1516, Fray Bernardino de Mera, a Dominican Father, was made the Bishop; but neither he nor his successor, a Franciscan born at Flanders and appointed in 1522, ever came to take possession of their See. Fray Miguel Ramirez de Salamanca, a native of Burgos, also a son of St. Dominic, was then appointed (1528), and he was actually the first Bishop in the island.

The friars of this order did not succeed in having any convent built in Cuba until the year 1578, when, thanks to the generous assistance of several citizens, and pre-eminently of the Count and Countess of Casa Bayona, whose portraits not long ago could yet be seen hanging on the walls of the sacristy, the monumental building which stands near the Palace of the Captain-General, at Havana, was erected for them.

This noble edifice, in which Saint Luis Beltran occupied a room, while on his way to Spain, has been memorable in the history of Cuba, because of its intimate connection with the intellectual progress of the country. At the earnest request of Fray Diego Romero, one of the priests of this house, supplemented by the action of the City Council of Havana, and of other persons and corporations, the "Royal and Pontifical University of St. Jerome," was established at that convent in 1721, and entrusted to the Dominican Fathers. This University was given the same rank and prerogatives as the University of Alcalá de Henares, which had been Cardinal Cisneros' pet, and soon developed into a seat of learning of great celebrity. In 1761 it had three chairs of theology, one of philosophy,—one of what was called "the Aristotelic text," another of what was called "the Master of Sentences,"—three of civil law, two of canon law, four of medicine, and two of mathematics.

Subsequently to that date, new classes were established, in which all branches were taught, and as well and thoroughly as in any contemporary establishment of Europe; and as the teaching was gratuitous<sup>1</sup> and the doors of the classes were open to all, the

---

<sup>1</sup> The matriculation fee required of the students of the University was merely nominal *fifteen cents (real y medio)*. The graduation fee, in the degree of doctor, consisted in a pair of gloves and a silk handkerchief for each member of the Faculty.

institution became extremely popular, and constituted before long one of the most important factors in the civilization of the country.

In addition to their University labors, many of the priests devoted themselves, gratuitously also, to the teaching of Latin, and Logics, and even Moral Theology, with the book of Father Laraga as text, at extra hours and in their own rooms; and in this way they prepared many a young man for admission either to the University, or to the Seminary for priests attached to the Cathedral, and made their name and their remembrance still more imperishable.

Even after the suppression of the religious orders, these venerable men retained their habits of imparting knowledge to the youth; and the writer of this paper is happy to have a further opportunity at this moment to renew his debt of admiration and gratitude to that noble son of St. Dominic, Fray Ambrosio Herrera, who, while at the convent of Guanabacoa, where he had been sent after the secularization of the University and the suppression of the religious orders, opened in his room a class of Latin and devoted himself from 7 to 9 in the morning, and 7 to 9 in the evening, to the instruction of about twenty or twenty-five boys, who loved him dearly. Neither one cent nor a present did he ever accept; and a portion of his breakfast was regularly distributed among his pupils.

This convent of Havana, in which there were sometimes fifty priests, and even more, became to some extent the real centre of the order in Spanish America. It was, indeed, one of the noblest, grandest and most beneficial institutions of its kind ever founded this side of the Atlantic. And when the University was taken out of the hands of the friars and turned over to the government and made a secular institution, and the matriculation fees were increased from 15 cents to \$25 in Philosophy and \$102 in Law, Medicine, Pharmacy and Theology, the people received a blow which the course of time has not been sufficient as yet to remove entirely from their memory.

There was also a Dominican convent at the city of Bayamo, and another at the city of Santo Espiritu. The former was founded in 1742 and the latter in 1746. Neither of them was a large establishment; but the latter was especially beneficial, on account of a hospital of charity which was attached to it, under the invocation of Jesus of Nazareth.

The convent of Dominicans at Guanabacoa, founded in 1758, was in the order of time the fourth and the last house which those excellent Fathers possessed in Cuba. It was also their last place of refuge. The building is immense, and the church attached to it, and consecrated under the advocacy of *Nuestra Señora de*



*la Candelaria*, is one of the largest and handsomest of the island. The religious festivities which were celebrated there on Candlemas day, the "novena" which preceded it, and the subsequent "octava," accompanied as they were always with public rejoicings of all kinds, and a fair where money circulated profusely, aided to increase the fame and the material prosperity of the town.

When the British besieged Havana in 1762, and took possession of Guanabacoa, they established their headquarters at this convent. But the outrageous manner in which they conducted themselves, especially in the church, drew upon them such an amount of hatred, that indeed their worst enemies and the most persistent and uncompromising were the citizens of that town.<sup>1</sup> The remembrance of some of these outrages is still fresh in the minds of the people, and has been transmitted faithfully from generation to generation.<sup>2</sup>

Besides the houses of the Dominicans and Franciscans, others were established profusely both in the Spanish West Indies, and on the Main land, or *Terra firma*, as it was called.

In Cuba, for instance, according to the statement published by order of the government, in pursuance of the decrees of secularization, on December 7, 1841, the number of the convents then in existence, and of their inmates, was as follows:

Order of St. Dominic: the four convents just mentioned with a total of 34 priests and 14 lay brothers.

Order of St. Francis: eight convents as described, with a total of 74 priests and many lay brothers.

Order of St. Augustin: one convent at Havana, with 8 priests and 4 lay brothers. They had classes of Latin and Philosophy.

Order of Our Lady of Mercy: two convents, one at Havana, and another at Puerto Principe, with a total of 27 priests and 2 lay brothers.

Order of Capuchins: one convent at Havana, with only 3 priests.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of Jose Antonio Gomez, one of the aldermen of the town became famous in the history of this war for his bold attacks against the British, and his successful leadership, in that locality. The British were so hated, that the people of Guanabacoa did not hesitate to poison the milk and even the water which they furnished them.

<sup>2</sup> Tradition has preserved among many other outrages perpetrated at the Church, the two following: The soldiers took from its place a picture of Our Lord, which still in the time of the writer of this paper was preserved in a very rich massive frame of silver, and placed it on the pulpit, as in the attitude of preaching, an act which was accompanied with all kinds of jests and irreverence. They also discovered that a statue of St. Francis Xavier, which was in an upper niche, on the sanctuary, had a valuable ring on one of the fingers. To pull down the statue, and get possession of the ring, they tried to lasso to it amidst laughter and mockery, by means of a rope. A historian relates that when the statue fell, it struck the head of the one who pulled the rope, and instantly killed him.

Order of Bethlehemites: two convents—one at Havana, with 3 priests and 10 lay brothers, and one at Santiago de Cuba with 2 priests. The Bethlehemites of Havana had a magnificent hospital for convalescents,—absolutely gratuitous, and also the largest primary school ever remembered in Cuba.<sup>1</sup> They taught gratuitously, to poor and rich, negro and white, noble and plebeian—because the school was open to all, and the prejudice of race, was never felt in Cuba as it is here, even now,—all the primary branches of instruction, that is, reading and writing, arithmetic and Christian doctrine. Those who showed superior talent or industry, received extra lessons of a more advanced character. They all were provided, gratuitously also, with pens and paper, and ink, and catechisms and readers if unable to buy them.

Order of St. John of God: two convents, one at Havana with 2 priests and 11 lay brothers, and one at Puerto Principe with 1 priest and 2 lay brothers. The members of this order were regular physicians, and had a charity hospital attached to their convents.

However imperfect the foregoing sketch may be considered,—and certainly no illusion is entertained by its author that it is an adequate presentation of the subject—it shows abundantly that the religious orders have a most brilliant history of their own in the New World, and that it is proper for Catholics as well as for just men in general to remember it with pride, and have it duly recognized in the approaching festivities.

In regard to the Jesuits, whatever might be said or done in grateful remembrance of their work in this hemisphere, north and south of the equator, would certainly fall short of the requirements of strict justice. Although they arrived in America at a later period than the Franciscans and the Dominicans, their missionary and educational labors were not less glorious and successful. The name of the Society of Jesus is preserved with veneration by the people from the remotest end of South America to the farthest northern extremity of Canada. And one who should ever attempt to write the history of the New World without giving that Order the credit due to it as a principal factor of American civilization, would be far from fulfilling his duty as a historian.

J. I. RODRIGUEZ.

---

<sup>1</sup> The average attendance was 500.

## THE NIMBUS AND AUREOLE.

THE Glory of God, in the sense in which the expression is ordinarily used in Holy Scripture and in the writings of saints and theologians, is of two kinds—essential and accidental. The essential glory of God consists in that absolute will of God which has, of necessity, been fulfilled from all eternity, and will be fulfilled to all eternity. The accidental glory of God is that manifestation of His essential glory which it is the object of creation to promote, although, in itself, it cannot add anything to the infinite glory which He has in Himself. Every external work of God brings to Him fresh accidental glory. All the splendors of the material world form a part of it; above all, the supernatural acts of His rational creatures contribute to it. To increase this accidental glory is the end and object of man; it is the glory of man, made as he is after the similitude of God, to glorify God on earth, as our Lord is said to have done by the complete and perfect performance of His will. Hence, as the will of God becomes more and more clearly reflected in the regenerate will and affections of the just man, he is said to be transformed into the same image, the image of God, from glory to glory.<sup>1</sup>

There is one special form of this accidental glory of God, its outward and sensible exhibition, which, in Holy Scripture, commonly receives the name of the glory of God, in the more literal and material meaning of the word. It consists in that brightness cognizable by the sense of sight, whereby God, who is in Himself light, uncreated and eternal, vouchsafed of old to give a sign of His more immediate presence amongst men. It is of this that we intend to speak in the present article.

The idea of visible light has always been intimately associated with the person of the Deity. In the natural order, we are accustomed to look upon the source of life as identical with the source of light. The sun, by whose beams this world of ours is vivified and enlightened, has, from the earliest ages, been regarded, and by some nations adored, as the visible symbol of the invisible and Supreme Being, of whose surpassing splendor the glory of the sun is but a faint and feeble image. St. John, speaking of the heavenly Jerusalem, says that the city had no need of the sun or of the moon to shine in it; “for the glory of God hath enlightened

---

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor., iii., 18.



it, and the Lamb is the lamp thereof."<sup>1</sup> The prophet Ezechiel, narrating the visions accorded to him of the unseen world, compares the light emanating from and enveloping the Deity, to fire. "I saw a likeness as of the appearance of fire," "as the appearance of brightness," "the glory of the God of Israel was there."<sup>2</sup> It was by a manifestation of this splendor, under the semblance of fire, that under the old Dispensation Jehovah usually made His presence known. When Moses was sent as a deliverer to Israel, his attention was, at first, attracted by a bush that was on fire and yet was not burnt. On his going forward to see what he terms this great sight, the unwonted spectacle of flames of fire that shone but did not scorch, that lit up, but did not consume the branches amongst which they played, the Lord God called to him out of the midst of the fire.<sup>3</sup> He was at once conscious that he stood in the presence of the living God, the unfading, self-existent light, the God whom his forefathers worshipped. This first apparition was to prepare him for the more dazzling glory that would be revealed when Jehovah graciously made a covenant with the Israelites on Horeb. On that occasion, He descended upon the mount in a luminous cloud, and the sight of the glory of the Lord is said to have been like a burning fire.<sup>4</sup> Moses, recalling at a later period the circumstances attendant on the giving of the law, says that the Lord spoke to them face to face, out of the midst of fire,<sup>5</sup> from out of the fiery effulgence which shrouded the Divinity from mortal sight. The psalmist uses no poetical metaphor, no eastern imagery, when, addressing God, he exclaims, Thou art clothed with light as with a garment.<sup>6</sup> And, as light and joy are intimately connected, he speaks of both as being found by those who are admitted to the glorious presence of God: Thou shalt fill me with joy with thy countenance.<sup>7</sup> The just shall walk in the light of thy countenance.<sup>8</sup> The *shechinah*, or cloud of glory and fire that covered the tabernacle of the Jewish temple whenever the presence of Jehovah was revealed in the sanctuary, was an external token of the indwelling majesty of the Godhead, before which even the ministering priests retired in reverent awe.<sup>9</sup>

The conviction that the nature and essence of God is ineffable light was a principle lying at the bottom of the Jewish religion. Thus, St. Paul, writing to his Hebrew converts, used language familiar to them when he spoke of Jesus Christ as the brightness of His Father's glory.<sup>10</sup> Under the new Dispensation, this article of Jewish belief was maintained and confirmed by similar manifestations. The

<sup>1</sup> Ap., 21, 23.

<sup>4</sup> Ex., xxiv., 17.

<sup>7</sup> Ps., xv., 11.

<sup>9</sup> Ex., xl., 32; 3 Kings, viii., 10.

<sup>2</sup> Ezech., viii., 2, 4.

<sup>5</sup> Deut., v., 4.

<sup>3</sup> Ex., iii., 2.

<sup>6</sup> Ps., ciii., 2.

<sup>8</sup> Ps., lxxxviii., 16.

<sup>10</sup> Heb., i., 3.

visions wherewith St. John was favored in Patmos were not unlike the visions of the prophets of old. The insight accorded him into the unseen world showed him the throne of God encircled by a luminous irradiation, taking the colors of light and resembling a rainbow, while it was surrounded by a sea of fire and smoke. In describing the Son of Man in the glory of heaven, he finds nothing to which he can compare Him but the glorious radiance of the midday sun: His face was, as the sun shineth in his power,<sup>1</sup> was resplendent, that is, with a splendor so dazzling that the privileged apostle could not bear to gaze upon it. Tradition states, that at the moment when the Incarnate Word was born into the world, a light of intense brilliance filled the humble cave of Bethlehem, in literal fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaias:<sup>2</sup> Be enlightened, O Jerusalem, for my Light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. On the occasion of our Lord's transfiguration, when His divine nature was allowed to pierce the veil of His sacred humanity, the Evangelists assert that His face did shine as the sun, and His very garments became shining, or glittering.<sup>3</sup> On the day of Pentecost, it was under the shape of tongues of fire that the third Person of the Holy Trinity descended upon the Apostles. And when the Lord Jesus stayed Saul on the way to Damascus, so vivid was the light that shone from heaven, that it produced temporary blindness, and caused the fearless, resolute man to fall trembling and astonished to the ground.<sup>4</sup>

The dogma and the ritual of the Christian religion, both maintain the same truth which the Jews so firmly held. In the Creed we express our belief that the eternal Word is Light of Light, as He is God of God. In the ceremonial of divine worship artificial light is habitually used as a symbol of the celestial brightness of God's presence. Although the assemblies of early Christians were necessarily held by night, thus gaining for them the mockery of the pagans and the contemptuous epithet of *lucifuga gens*—the people who shun the light—yet, when the Church emerged from the catacombs, the lights which had been needed to illumine the subterranean chapels were retained in the sunlit basilicas of the city. In all the ceremonies, *lumina*, *lampades*, and *candelabra* held a prominent place, and it was customary, from the earliest times, to keep lamps burning upon the altar day and night. St. Paulinus, bishop of Nola, in the end of the fourth century, speaks of the great number of lights burning about the altar, "making night more splendid than day, and the light of day itself more glorious."<sup>5</sup> The custom of placing lamps on tombs, and lighting up a burying ground,

<sup>1</sup> Ap., i., 16.<sup>2</sup> Ch. lx., v. 1.<sup>3</sup> St. Matt., xvii., 2; St. Luke, ix., 29.<sup>4</sup> Acts, ix., 3.<sup>5</sup> Paulin., Nat., iii., S. Felicis.

practised by the early Christians, was also derived from the more enlightened of the Jews. For them, as for those, it was emblematic of the perpetual light which the Church implores may shine upon the faithful departed; of the glory which the children of God, the children of Light, enjoy in the presence of their Father, in accomplishment of the promise of the Saviour, That the just shall shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.<sup>1</sup> The inscriptions frequently found on sepulchral stones and tombs of early times, testify to the fact that light was considered as an emblem of celestial bliss, since God, who is Light, will be the happiness of the redeemed. *Luce nova frueris : lux tibi Christus adest*, may be quoted as an instance. De Rossi, the eminent professor of Christian archæology, has observed that in all the monuments which have been discovered in Byzantium and Numidia, the saints and the faithful are represented as being in Paradise by a candelabra as a symbol of light.

We know, moreover, that the glory of which God is the source and centre is communicated to the spirits who are in His presence, and whose privilege it is to gaze continually on his divine beauty. The holy angels, who are about his throne, reflect in their own persons the splendor of the Triune God; they are likened in Holy Scripture, on account of their brilliancy, to a flame of fire. When the Angel appeared to the shepherds who were keeping the night-watches over their flocks, and announced to them the birth of a Saviour, it is said that the brightness of God shone around about them, and the supernatural character of this light, inspiring the rude peasants with awe, caused them to fear with a great fear.<sup>2</sup> When the Angel of the Lord went to conduct Peter out of the prison, a celestial light shone in the room, and illuminated the gloomy precincts of the dungeon as they passed out into the street.<sup>3</sup> Nor is this light communicated to pure spirits alone. The children of God on earth are heirs of glory; the redeemed, after their admission into the presence of God, shine with the joy of beholding the Divine countenance, and the glorified body, too, reflects, in a greater or less degree, the brightness of the eternal Godhead. Amongst the sublime revelations made to St. John in Patmos, he was privileged to behold the Mother of God in heaven, and in these words he describes the stupendous sight: A woman clothed with the sun.<sup>4</sup> And not the Queen of Angels alone, but many saints and servants of God have been seen after their decease, on different occasions, clothed with celestial radiance. The Blessed Egidius saw, in a trance, the soul of Consalvus, freed from the body, shining with a wondrous splendor and borne by angels

<sup>1</sup> St. Matt., xiii., 43.<sup>2</sup> St. Luke, ii., 9.<sup>3</sup> Acts, xii., 7.<sup>4</sup> Ap., xii., 1.



through space. It is recorded in the life of a newly-canonized saint, Alonzo Rodriguez, that a departed Jesuit, for whom he was praying earnestly, appeared to him in the enjoyment of the Beatific vision, his face glorious as the sun, with rays of light streaming from his body. The same saint himself was seen, shortly after his death, clad in a robe of magnificent brocade, his whole person beaming with radiance, by a priest who had thought the honors paid to the humble lay-brother somewhat undue.

But it is not only to the disembodied spirit that this lustre is imparted. The frail tenement of clay which, while it is the prison-house of the soul, is also the temple of the Holy Ghost, sometimes participates at the close of its earthly existence in the glory of the soul that informed it, and to which it is, at a later period, to be reunited. It is no uncommon thing for the mortal remains of the saints to emit an ineffable light as well as to exhale a delicious fragrance. The bodies of Christian martyrs, cast into the river or upon the dunghill by command of the Roman judge, were frequently discovered by their friends through the light that hovered over them. The spot where the remains of St. James of Compostella were interred, forgotten for centuries, was revealed by means of a miraculous light, which appeared every night, and attracted the attention of the bishop of the diocese. Gregory of Tours relates that, in his day, at the grave of St. Thomas, in India, there was a lamp which burned without oil or wick, and which no wind could extinguish. It is said that, on St. Jerome's death, a great light, as of the noonday sun, shone about him. The body of St. Ignatius of Antioch, at his martyrdom, was seen by the bystanders to shine like gold or silver. At the moment when the soul of St. Amideus, one of the seven holy founders of the Servite Order, was freed from its earthly prison, a brilliant light was seen in and around the convent, illuminating the whole of Monte Senario, and visible from a great distance. And of St. Buongiunta, another of the same group of saints, it is recorded that, at the time of his happy death, standing before the altar where he had just said Mass, his face, like that of the protomartyr, Stephen, shone like the face of an angel. And as the immortal soul sometimes enjoys on earth a foretaste of future blessedness, so the mortal body, before its dissolution, may reflect some rays of the glory in store for it hereafter. It will be remembered, that after Moses had been holding converse with Jehovah on Mount Sinai, we are told, that when he came down from the mountain his countenance beamed with the reflection of the divine glory: Moses "knew not that his face was horned from the conversation of the Lord," and Aaron and the children of Israel seeing it, were afraid to come near, so that Moses had to put a veil upon

his face, for the glory of his countenance;<sup>1</sup> a circumstance which doubtless added much to the respect wherewith the people, whose leader and legislator he was, regarded him, and prepared them to receive the law he was commissioned to deliver to them.

Instances abound in the pages of Christian hagiology in which close communion with heaven had had a like marvellous effect upon the human body. When Maximinus the bishop repaired, in obedience to St. Mary Magdalen's summons, to the church whither she had been miraculously transported to receive the Blessed Sacrament before her death, he found her in the midst of a choir of angels, elevated in the air, her face shining as the sun from constant converse with angels. St. Andrew, nailed to the cross, preached for two days and two nights to the crowds who were attracted to the place of his martyrdom by the effulgence that shone around him. The holy bishop Ambrose, whilst dictating to his deacon, Paulinus, was seen by him suddenly covered with a shield of fire or glory. When St. Columba celebrated Mass for the last time, on the Sunday preceding his death, his face was illuminated by a glow of light which he explained as caused by the vision of an angel who had been sent to demand "a deposit dear to God." When St. John of the Cross offered the Holy Sacrifice, rays of light used to issue from his countenance. St. Peter of Alcantara was accustomed to recite his breviary at night by the light of his fingers. We are told that St. Francis of Sales, passing the night at a friend's house, was observed by his host at prayer in his room by the light that streamed through the chinks of the ill-fitting boards. In the process of St. Benedict Labre's canonization, several priests, and other witnesses, attested that, on entering a church in which the humble beggar was engaged in prayer at a time when it was deserted and dark except from the glimmer of a few tapers, they beheld an extraordinary light, surpassing in brilliancy that of hundreds of wax candles, enveloping his person, and growing more vivid around his head. On more than one occasion he was thought to be on fire, as sparks scintillated from his countenance and fell on the ground where he knelt.

The pictorial representation in Christian art of the light clothing and emanating from the Divinity, and communicated to persons of eminent sanctity, is called the nimbus, or the aureole.

The nimbus, which, according to the etymology of the word, ought to possess the characteristics of a luminous cloud or vapor, assumes ordinarily the shape of a circular disc, generally opaque, surrounding the head. Sometimes it is nothing more than a halo, or a radiation of light issuing from the head, variously represented by rays of unequal length. Sometimes the rays are linked to-

---

<sup>1</sup> Ex., xxxiv., 29, 30.

gether at about half their length by a circle which appears to confine them; sometimes the connecting line is nearer to the head and the rays, instead of emanating from the head, start from the circle surrounding it. Again, in some instances, clusters of rays pass beyond the circumscribing line and diverge in different directions, as light proceeding from a centre diverges; or the circle is broken by convergent rays, broad at the base, where they meet the head, and at the other extremity forming points like those of a star. The nimbus is a Christian symbol suggested by pagan art, where it is frequently met with. The idea that the dwelling place of the immortal gods was the centre of eternal and unfailing light, and that their presence amongst mortals was accompanied by a visible and material glory, was a universal and firmly rooted belief amongst the ancients. At the birth of Zoroaster, that pure emanation of the divinity of the Persians, his body is said to have emitted an effulgence which illuminated the whole chamber. Krishna lighted up by the rays emanating from his person the place where he passed his infancy. Eastern iconography embodies this idea in its delineations of the innumerable gods and goddesses of the pantheon. They are mostly represented encircled by brilliant rays or flames of fire. Maga, the Hindu goddess, wears a large nimbus or semi-aureole, the circumference of which is indented, the field striated with rays. Parallel with the temples and forehead of the figure three clusters of rays dart forth, corresponding exactly with the divine nimbus of Christian iconography. Surya, the golden-handed, the divine vivifier, stands in a chariot drawn by seven steeds, surrounded by a circle of light. Even the blood-thirsty Kalu is encircled by flamboyant rays. In the sacred Vedas Buddha is described as coming down from heaven "crowned with a rose-hued aureole." Egyptian art places behind the head of Isis, Horus, Osiris and others a flat, golden disc, typical of the sun; occasionally this is given to the Pharaohs, who were termed sons of the sun, sons of gods. The Persian and Arabic MSS. represented the heads of their kings and superhuman personages surmounted or surrounded by pyramids of fire. The great Syrian goddess has rays of light proceeding from her head. In Etruscan sculpture, Apollo is seen adorned with the nimbus and crowned with seven rays; Diana with the crescent above, a nimbus behind her head; while Mercury, recognizable by his wings and caduceus, wears a nimbus in no wise differing from that used by Christians in later times. The Greeks and Romans made constant use of this symbol as denoting divine power and authority. Virgil describes Juno as *nimbo succincta*.<sup>1</sup> Servius defines the nimbus

---

<sup>1</sup> *Æn.* x., 34.



wherewith Pallas was distinguished at the destruction of Troy as *fulgidum lumen quo decorum capita cinguntur*.<sup>1</sup> In a fresco at Herculaneum Circe shows herself to Ulysses, her head encircled by a nimbus. The Lateran museum contains a statue discovered at Ostia with a nimbus composed of rays of gilt bronze. This radiated nimbus is frequently given to symbolical creatures. The coins of the time of the Antonines bear on the reverse a phoenix, the emblem of immortality, its head enclosed by an indented nimbus. On the coins of Faustina eternity is represented by a peacock adorned in a similar manner.

This conventional ornament, given at first by the Greeks and Romans to the gods, was extended to the effigies of the Emperors, after they began to claim divine honors. The *lux divinum verticem claro orbe complectens* is associated with the fasces and curule chair as symbols of imperial dignity. Trajan has it on the arch of Constantine. It encircles the head of Antoninus Pius on a medal bearing his image. An ancient silver shield found near Geneva in 1722, shows Valentinian adorned with a nimbus, distributing gifts to his soldiers after a victory. On the great shield of Theodosius both the emperor himself and his sons are similarly distinguished. Constantine the Great wears it on some of the coins struck in his reign. The statues of the Merovingian kings which formerly decorated the chief portal of St. Germain-des-Près in Paris, are described as having the nimbus as a sign of regal dignity. In this same sense it is given to the Emperor Justinian, represented in a mosaic of the year 560 in the principal portico of St. Sophia, at Constantinople, kneeling, with Oriental devotion, at the feet of Christ. Heads of the Madonna and St. Michael, in medallions on each side of the throne whereon Christ is seated, are without the nimbus. Priam and Cassandra have it in the Vatican Virgil. In a MS. of the Book of Josue, dating from the 7th or 8th century, not only Josue himself, but several cities represented under the form of female figures, are thus adorned. In the East, where the saints of the Old Testament are far more venerated than in the West, as is testified by the more frequent use of their names among the Greeks, the nimbus was given with great prodigality. The illuminated pages of the MSS. of the 7th to the 10th century, show it assigned to all manner of quasi-sacred personages, *e.g.*, Moses and Eli, Balaam and Samuel, Nathan and Jonas, Isaïas, Ezechiel and the prophetess Anna. Nor is it withheld from persons of a different type, witness Saul, who died by his own hand; Achab, who persecuted the prophets of the Lord; the impious Pharaoh, the cruel Herod, Judas, the traitor. Nay more, even the Spirit of

<sup>1</sup> *Ad. En.* ii., 615.

Evil appears in Byzantine art with a nimbus, as, for instance, in one illuminated page where he is portrayed dancing with infernal joy before Job, who is seated on the ruins of his house. This proves that it was considered as an attribute of power or dignity, whether good or evil. Examples might be multiplied of its use in this purely secular sense both in religious and profane art. Occasionally it serves merely to mark the principal figures of a group; in the arch of St. Mary Major we see it assigned to Herod as well as to Christ; in the mosaics of St. Vitalis, at Ravenna, to the Emperor Justinian and Theodora his wife, as well as to our Lord and to the Angels. Allegorical figures, too, and symbolical birds and beasts are frequently nimbed.

It may be laid down as a rule that the nimbus does not appear as a peculiarly Christian symbol before the 6th century. About that period it began to be adopted in Christian art as a token of special sanctity, as a pictorial representation of the never fading crown of glory promised as the reward of supernatural virtue and eminent holiness. In the exclusively Christian art of the first five centuries it was almost unknown, instances of its introduction in the catacombs being extremely rare. The vast majority of the frescoes and glasses belonging to the early centuries represent the figure of Christ without the nimbus. In several instances it is found surrounding the head of the Lamb when emblematic of the Saviour. Any work of art in which it is given to Our Lady or the Apostles must certainly be consigned to a later period. For a time its use appears to have been optional, as on one and the same monument the same person is occasionally seen both with and without it; for instance, the frescoes of St. Mary Major, where in the scene of the Annunciation the Blessed Virgin is depicted with the nimbus, whilst in the Presentation she is without it. Buonarruoti gives an illustration of a very curious glass on which St. Stephen is represented sitting listening to the teaching of Christ. Neither of the two figures have the nimbus, whilst between them is a small figure of Christ in the act of benediction, which is nimbed. The reason of this distinction is clearly because the one is intended to represent Christ as a teacher upon earth, the other shows Him in His glorified body, as seen by Stephen in a vision.

The seventh and two following centuries witnessed the transition from the almost complete absence of the nimbus as a Christian symbol to the constant use of it in its spiritual signification of the divine glory, the light of heaven. The images of the Persons of the Holy Trinity were the first to be thus distinguished, and the sacred Humanity of Christ after His ascension, or in the scenes taken from His life on earth wherein His miraculous power was manifested. The angels came next in order, when depicted

in their character of celestial messengers to mankind, as when appearing to Zachary in the temple, to Mary at the Annunciation, or in pictures of the Nativity, Resurrection, etc. Somewhat later the nimbus is given to the Blessed Virgin and then to the apostles. In Byzantine art the growth of the cultus of the Mother of God may be traced—especially after the council which suppressed the Nestorian heresy—by the nimbus being assigned to her and not to the apostles. Witness the Ascension in the cupola of St. Sophia at Salonica, where she occupies the chief place in the centre of the group of apostles, whose upturned gaze follows their Master's ascending form. The same thing may be remarked in the ancient Syriac gospels in the Medicean Library at Florence. In the East the nimbus retained its signification as an attribute of dignity and authority longer than in the West. Here it speedily became symbolic of sanctity alone.<sup>1</sup> It was denied to a king unless he was a saint or reputed as such, and granted to a beggar like St. Alexis; a shepherdess like St. Genevieve, a boatman like St. Julian, provided the innocence and mortification of their lives reflected unmistakably the light of heaven and merited for them "the crown of beauty which the just shall receive at the hand of the Lord."<sup>2</sup> And as, to the Pagan, the nimbus around the head of monarchs and demi-gods signified the divine power wherewith they were invested, so, to the Christian it signified the gleam from the unseen world which it is sometimes permitted to mortals to behold resting on the chosen servants of God, or hovering over the place of their sepulture. It is related of a painter who was engaged in painting the figure of St. Anthony on the wall of the tomb where his remains were deposited, that while he was removing the surface of the wall around the head of the figure, before gilding the nimbus that was to surround it, suddenly through the chinks of space thus laid bare a light of extreme brilliance shone out, full in the artist's face, dazzling him to such an extent that he was compelled for a time to discontinue his work.

Although the most usual form of the nimbus is that of a circle, or disc of solid metal, or burnished gold, it also assumes other shapes and varies in color. Sometimes the disc is suspended above the head, very like the flat metal plates fastened in heathen times above the heads of statues standing in the open air, for the purpose of defending them from the rain and dust; in this case it is an oval, or circle seen in perspective. Up to the twelfth century it was frequently diaphanous or semi-transparent, indicating that the artist meant to represent a luminous irradiation; and as the clouds

---

<sup>1</sup> The name given to the nimbus in German is *Heiligenschein*, the lustre of saints.

<sup>2</sup> *Wisd.* v., 17.



take color from the sun's rays, so this glory, pictorial light, assumed the different hues of the spectrum. Gold is, however, by far the most prevalent, as being the most like to light or fire; it is almost invariably used for the Divine Persons, and also for the principal saints. The Old Testament saints often have a nimbus of silver. Red is the color supposed by some to belong to virgins, green to the married, pale yellow to penitents, etc., but these distinctions must be regarded as more fanciful than real. In the twelfth century or thereabouts, the nimbus frequently assumed the form of a broad golden band, a circlet surrounding or suspended over the head. When it is of a square or oblong shape, this denotes that the person to whom it is given was living at the time the work was executed, for the circle is symbolic of eternity, the square being the symbol used by ancient geometricians for the earth and the circle for heaven. A mosaic in the Church of St. Cecilia, at Rome, shows Pope Pascal bearing a model of the church of which he was the founder; in this his nimbus is square. Another mosaic represents St. Peter giving to Leo III. the insignia of the papacy, and a standard to Charlemagne; the glory round the head of the Apostle is circular, round those of the Pope and the Emperor, from whose reign the work dates, it is quadrilateral. Again, in a miniature preserved at Monte Cassino, St. Benedict is delineated delivering the rules of the Order to the Abbot John. Both the Holy Founder and an angel who is present have a round nimbus, whereas in the case of the abbot, in whose lifetime the painting was finished, it is oblong. It is to be regretted that this distinction of shape was not universally observed, as it would be of value in determining the date of the monument whereon it were found. In some rare instances the nimbus is lozenge-shaped, while in the works of Italian artists about the ninth century it takes the peculiar form of a scroll of parchment unfolded in the centre and remaining partially rolled at each end. The triangular form, which does not appear until a later period, is reserved for the first Person of the Holy Trinity; sometimes rays issue from each side of it.

Very frequently the nimbus is ornamented with various devices, or letters; or the name of the Saint whose head it encircles is inscribed upon it to remove all doubt of identity. The *A* and *Ω* are often seen in the nimbus of Christ. A cruciform nimbus, either with or without the circle, now peculiar to the Saviour was, formerly appropriated to all the three Persons of the Godhead, to distinguish the Creator from His creatures. The disc is intersected by bars increasing in width at the circumference, which, meeting in the centre, cross it at right angles, thus forming what is called a Greek cross. One of the half bars is concealed by the head, the others extend, one vertically from the summit of the head, the

others horizontally from the temples. The propriety of the Redeemer being represented with a nimbus thus decorated is obvious; but why, it may be asked, should it be given to the Eternal Father and the Holy Spirit? It seems doubtful that in this ornament an allusion is designed to the cross of Calvary, the more so as the halo encircling several Hindu and Buddhist divinities, and of some gods of the Romans, is, as we have seen, marked with a similar cross, and it cannot be imagined that in these instances the instrument of the Passion is indicated. We must, therefore, conclude that the cross or transverse rays in the divine nimbus are expressive of the eternal sovereignty of God extending in all directions. This opinion is confirmed by the fact that a right hand, issuing from a cloud, and decorated with a nimbus containing a cross, is no unusual symbolic representation of the power of the Most High. The ignorance of artists often leads to the Divine Persons being depicted with a plain nimbus. This happened often in the infancy of Christian art; on many of the earliest pictures of Christ on sarcophagi or elsewhere, He has a nimbus in no wise differing from that of the Apostles near Him. A contrary and much less common error is that of representing an ordinary mortal with the crossed nimbus. An ancient psalter, for instance, of the ninth century, contains at the commencement, within an illuminated capital, a young man holding a book in his left hand and in his right a pen, which he is in the act of dipping into the ink, while he listens to the inspirations of a dove hovering close to his ear. This writer, doubtless intended for David, wears the divine nimbus. In a French MS., of the tenth century also, the foremost of the three angels who visited Abraham, is similarly distinguished.

A missal of the fifteenth century contains a painting of the nativity of the Blessed Virgin, in which a golden cruciform nimbus is given to the Infant Mary, her person also being enclosed in an aureole. This is, however, an isolated and almost solitary instance of divine attributes being ascribed to Our Lady.

The nimbus is given, besides, to allegorical figures, personifications; for example, of the cardinal and theological virtues, or characters familiar to us in the parables of the Gospel, such as the wise and foolish virgins. During mediæval times the Church was frequently represented as a female, crowned and nimbued, holding a chalice and a cross.

The aureole appears in Christian art somewhat later than the nimbus, and is quite distinct from it. The nimbus, as has been said, encircles the head; the aureole envelopes the whole figure. The nimbus is round like the head. The form of the aureole is an elongated oval, usually a vesica piscis. Occasionally it is a quatrefoil. It is seldom otherwise than golden in hue, as its name

indicates (*aurculus*, golden). According to another derivation, the name comes from *aureola*, the diminutive of *aura*, a zephyr, breath, a flame. The origin of the aureole is traced by some writers to the images within bucklers, *imaginès clypeatæ* of the Romans, in which a bust or half-length figure stands out in relief from a round or oval shield. These were suspended in the temples, and may have suggested to Christian artists the idea of placing the head or figure of a saint in a medallion or blind window in churches, as was often done. In one of the mosaics, in St. Mary Major, the aureole takes the character of a solid shield, protecting the persons of Moses and Aaron from the stones hurled at them by the adherents of Kore and his companions. This recalls the words of the psalmist, Thou hast crowned the just as with a shield of Thy good will.<sup>1</sup>

As a rule, to which the above instance forms an exception, the aureole is the distinctive attribute of the glorified body. Rarely found in heathen art, in Christian iconography its use is exclusively restricted to the Persons of the Holy Trinity, to the Blessed Virgin, and to the souls of the just represented under the symbol of a child unclothed. It is given to the sacred humanity of our Lord in representations of the Transfiguration, the Resurrection, the Ascension; when He is standing, or seated on his throne in heaven, and when, at the Second Advent, He comes with clouds of light to judge the world. Didron thus defines the circumstances under which it is given to Our Lady: When she is holding her divine Son in her arms; when, at the Assumption, she is carried by angels to heaven; when, at the last judgment, she intercedes for sinners; and when she is depicted as the Woman of the Apocalypse. Scarcely a single instance is known of the aureole being given to angels, excepting in the delineation of the nine hierarchies in the Cathedral of Chartres, where the thrones are enclosed in an elliptical aureole of a red color, as being depositaries of Divine Power, and consequently entitled to one of the attributes of the Godhead. Doubtless, to this choir the angel belonged whom St. John saw coming down from heaven,<sup>2</sup> having great power, and enlightening the earth with His glory, the glory, that is, of the Almighty God. In another window of the same cathedral of Chartres, the soul of St. Martin is seen ascending to heaven in a vesica piscis, as St. Benedict is said to have beheld the soul of Germanus, Bishop of Padua, conveyed to heaven in a sphere of fire. In representations of the weighing of souls by St. Michael in the balance after death, or of the contest of good and evil spirits for their possession, the disembodied spirits of the just, generally under the

<sup>1</sup> Ps., v., 13.

<sup>2</sup> Ap., xviii., 1.



form of tiny nude figures, are depicted enclosed in a shining aureole, or surrounded with a glory of golden rays, already resplendent with the eternal light.

What is in art specifically termed the glory is a combination of the nimbus and aureole. It is a radiance of no definite shape, a splendor or luminous cloud proceeding from the whole figure, of greater intensity and brilliancy around the head. This strict definition is, however, not invariably adhered to ; the word aureole being employed not only for the glory, but occasionally—although quite wrongly—to designate the halo about the head alone. The aureole differs from the glory in having a clearly defined outline ; it is sometimes ornamented with various devices, spangled with stars, filled with clouds, supported by the hands of angels, or surrounded with flamboyant rays. It is a sign of apotheosis, being rightfully given to none but those who have entered into the *locum pacis et lucis*, into the brightness of celestial glory, of the eternity to which the Christian looks forward, and in the light of which he ought to live.

ELLIS SCHREIBER.

---

## COLUMBUS AND THE "SCIENTIFIC" SCHOOL.

IN this year of grace, America will offer, justly offer, tributes rich and many to the discoverer of the New World. Patient, earnest student of books and of nature, he deserves an especial tribute from American students, and above all from Catholic American students. How could, how should they honor him? By turning into English, word for word, and by editing in the most scholarly way his writings, the official documents referring to him before and after the discovery, and the *Historic*, attributed to his son, Don Fernando.

To-day, as when living, Columbus is the victim of "the perfidy of the envious, the calumny of the traducer." In the New World where, first of men, "he planted the sacred sign of the Cross," and where humbly,—proudly, first of men, he uttered "the Divine name of the Redeemer, name which, to the sound of the murmuring waves, he had so often sung upon the open sea"—even here, there are spiritless men who would again fasten upon him "the chains with which, though innocent, he was loaded." To the perfidious, the envious, the calumniator, Columbus made answer during his lifetime. His mind, heart, soul; his deeds, motives, habits, sufferings,—the man,—we know, intimately, from the records he made, and that have been happily preserved. "*Columbus is one of us.*" A Catholic, we owe him at least the love, the loyalty of brothers. From none else can he expect justice. In his deeds we have, ever shall have a part. The reflection of his glory shines upon each one of us, glorifies us. How great that glory is! "By his work a new world flashed forth from the unexplored ocean, thousands upon thousands of mortals were returned to the common society of the human race, were led from a barbarous life to peacefulness and civilization, and—what is of much more importance—were recalled from perdition to eternal life by the bestowal of the gifts which Jesus Christ brought to the world."

Truly, "no grander, no more beautiful work, has been ever accomplished by the hand of man. And to him who accomplished it, there are few who can be compared in greatness of soul and of genius." The calumniators, the traducers, are bold because all the proofs of the greatness of soul of Columbus, are not within reach of the people. With a show of learning—false show—the calumniators misstate facts. They misquote, mistranslate, garble the very words of the genius, whose shoe-lachets they are not worthy

to untie. Deliberately they smother his voice, "tear out his tongue,"—belie his thought. To him, as to the English speaking world, no more timely service could be done, no surer way of confounding his enemies could be devised, than by "popularizing" his writings and true history.

By the united action of all our Catholic historical societies, the work could be done. From South America, from Spain, from Italy, from France and England, help would freely come. The encouragement of our hierarchy would not be wanting. From the illustrious, the learned Pope, who has just spoken so justly of the great discoverer, something more than kind words would surely come. The task would be arduous, but not so arduous as that which Columbus performed. The pay could not be less than he received. Glory there would be, though not equalling his glory. Defending truth, our learned men would testify publicly, lastingly, to their mindfulness of the debt American Catholics owe to the great soul and great genius, who inspired by their faith, risked and suffered that he might "open access to the Gospel in new lands and in new seas."<sup>1</sup>

Why the discoverer of the New World should have suffered from perfidy and from calumny during his lifetime, and why, immediately after his death, detractors should have sought to sully his fair fame, we can easily understand. The honors he won, the power he temporarily exercised, his very virtues embittered the Spaniard, hidalgo, pilot, seaman, colonist, official and cleric. Ambition foiled, greed repressed, criminality punished, disorder restrained, virtue and piety taught by example,—have ever excited the most virulent passions of the human heart, envy, hatred, the spirit of revenge. But to-day, when Columbus has been nigh four hundred years in the grave, why should men, with whose ambitions or vices he cannot interfere, pursue him as though he had shamed them by his example, or, by his grand actions, had made them feel their own littleness? Must we seek an answer in the fashionable and convenient "atavism." With a qualification, we answer: Yes, from father to son, hates are handed down that have not been caused by ambition, envy or greed—hates born of prejudice; and there are new hates daily born out of ignorance, out of conceit, out of the evil spirit of notoriety, and out of the prolific father of lies. How shall we classify our contemporary defamers of him who accomplished a work so grand and so beautiful that no man has ever surpassed it? Perhaps they do not admit of classification

---

<sup>1</sup> This quotation and the previous quotations, are taken from the "Letter of Leo XIII. to the Archbishops and Bishops of Spain, Italy and the two Americas, upon Christopher Columbus," dated July 16, 1892.



under any heading here suggested; and, if so, it may be to their credit.

Among recent book-makers who have chosen Columbus as a timely subject, Mr. Justin Winsor must be mentioned.<sup>1</sup> Were he as capable as he is pretentious, he might hope to become a historian, in the distant future at least. Beyond his pretensions he displays no quality more than common, if we except his humor. The only American historian who, in respect of humor, will bear a comparison with Mr. Winsor, is the famous Mr. Twain. Reading amusedly the Harvard Librarian's pages we say, again and again: The writer is making game of us. Evidently, an oddish mind has imagined a comic "Christopher Columbus." The idea is novel. And what a surprise for those who take the author seriously, when he acknowledges the whole thing to be a joke!

How varied, how spontaneous, how artful, Mr. Winsor's humor is, a few extracts from his tome will show. Writing of Columbus in Portugal, our author says: His wife's sister, by the accepted accounts, had married Pedro Correa, *a navigator* not without fame in those days, and a companion in maritime inquiry upon whom Columbus could naturally depend,—*unless, as Harrisse decides, he was no navigator at all.*<sup>2</sup> A Celt would have written: "at all, at all;" but even without the repetition, we estimate this as one of the choicest of American "bulls." And a "bull" is always humorous, especially if it be, as it is here, deliberate.

A few pages further on, the author is debating "whether or not," Columbus had ever sailed to the far north. "The only evidence that Columbus saw Tile," our author assures us, "is in what he further says, that he was able to ascertain that the tide rose and fell twenty-six fathoms, which observation necessitates the seeing of *some land, whether Tile or not.*"<sup>3</sup> Those who do not see the humor in this passage may accuse Mr. Winsor of confusion of thought; but later quotations will make it evident that he can confuse thought without being knowingly humorous. Were we not convinced that we have presented an example of Winsorian humor, we should readily label the extract ludicrous confusion.

On page 160, we meet with a happy "hit," which, if we do not mistake, is at least a triple *entendre*. The author is portraying Ferdinand, and Mr. Winsor's portraits are never "the filling up of a scant outline with the colors of an unfaithful limner."<sup>4</sup> No, indeed! However, let us hasten to see Ferdinand. "The king, perhaps, was good enough for a king as such personages went in the fif-

<sup>1</sup> *Christopher Columbus, and How He Received and Imparted the Spirit of Discovery*. New York, 1892.

<sup>2</sup> *Christopher Columbus*, p. 131. The italics are ours.

<sup>3</sup> Winsor, p. 135. Italics ours.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 84.

teenth century; "perhaps" and "went," you feel the art, surely; "but his *smiles* and *remorseless coldness* were *mixed* as few could mix them even in those days." Even in those days! Perfection itself! The limning has all the gleefulness of conviviality. Remark the mixing, "as few could mix them," of "smiles" with "coldness,"—remorseless coldness! And the conception of the expert king thus mixing *his* smiles! In filling up a scant outline with color—of a suspiciously ruby tinge—Mr. Winsor is unapproachable.

From a brilliant palette, the artist selects a charming combination of tints with which to fill in a scant outline of Isabella. He knows how to place, masterfully, a humorous dab. Santangel is in the queen's "cabinet." He is pleading with Isabella to recall Columbus. "A shade came over the queen's face. The others knew it was the thought of Ferdinand's *aloofness*."<sup>1</sup> In that one quaint, delightful, Twainish word, "aloofness," what a wealth of burlesque humor is safe-deposited! A shade of aloofness! Mr. Winsor is almost too funny.

Always catching, his humor is never forced. As an example of bubbling, natural fun, we shall quote from p. 276. Columbus, on the second voyage, arrives at Hispaniola, but finds no trace of those he had left behind. In quest of information, he visits Guacanagari. Only a master dare venture to be jocosely at this moment. Mr. Winsor has no fear. "The interview did not end," he says, "without some strange manifestations on the part of the cacique, *which* led the Spaniards for a moment to fear that *a trial of arms* was to come. The chief was not indisposed to *try his legs enough* to return with the Admiral to his ship that very evening."<sup>2</sup> With this passage as a text, one might compose a volume on the science and art of humor. Note how the "which" happily prepares a reader for a surprise; and how the word "enough" restrains the risible propensities within due bounds "to try his legs enough!" Classical, indeed!

From the pages of "Christopher Columbus," we have culled more good things than are usually found in a sarsaparilla almanac. Regretfully we are compelled to retain the greater number of them for our own delectation. The reader will pardon us a word of caution. Read Mr. Winsor carefully. Be on the "alert" always. He is at times over-refined, and unless your attention be constant, you are sure to miss many of his nicest effects.

We hesitate to do our author an injustice by assuming that his work is wholly, or even partly, serious. If it were serious, then his pretentiousness would be more amusing than his humor. Re-

<sup>1</sup> Winsor, p. 178.

<sup>2</sup> We have used italics here, lest some one might miss any portion of the humor.

viewing the biographers of Columbus, Mr. Winsor finds them all inferior to himself. Washington Irving, especially, he contemns and condemns. It is true that Irving "produced a book that has long remained for the English reader a standard biography. Irving's canons of biography were not, however, such as the *fearless* and *discriminating* student of to-day would approve." "The learning which probes long-established pretenses and grateful deceits was not acceptable to Mr. Irving."<sup>1</sup> Alexander H. Everett said that the perfection of Irving's book was the despair of critics, but Mr. Everett "was forgetful of a method of critical research that is not prone to be dazed by the prestige of demigods."<sup>2</sup> The "fearless" champion of the "not prone to be dazed method" quiets our alarm with the soothing statement that, though "dangerously seductive to the popular sense," "Irving's book has lost ground in these later years among scholarly inquirers. They have by the collation of its narrative with the original sources discovered its flaccid character. They have outgrown the witcheries of its graceful style. They have learned to put at their value the repetitious changes of stock sentiment which swell the body of the text, sometimes provokingly."<sup>3</sup> Humboldt evidences "a critical spirit, in which Irving was deficient ;"<sup>4</sup> "Irving, whose heedless embellishments of the story of these times may amuse the pastime reader, but hardly satisfy the student."<sup>5</sup> "Irving at one time berates the biographer who lets "pernicious erudition" destroy a world's exemplar; and at another time he does not know that he is criticising himself when he says that "he who paints a great man merely in great and heroic traits, though he may produce a fine picture, will never present a faithful portrait."<sup>6</sup> Thus the learned prober of "grateful deceits," the scholarly inquirer, swells the body of his text, to the amusement of the "pastime reader," with heedless "beratings" of the not unscholarly or uncritical Irving. The "witcheries" of Mr. Winsor's style may prove seductive to popular lovers of nonsense; but, on the whole, we imagine that the verdict of students will be that he is provokingly repetitious and altogether debarred from the prestige of a demigod.

Mr. Prescott, our critic graciously concedes, was "more independent in his views of the individual character round which *so much revolves*, and the reader is not wholly blinded to the unwholesome deceit and overweening selfishness of Columbus." And yet "Prescott shared something of the spirit of Irving in composing a history to be read as a pastime rather than as a study

<sup>1</sup> Winsor, p. 56. Italics ours.

<sup>3</sup> Winsor, p. 60.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 233.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 57.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 51.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 501.



of completed truth."<sup>1</sup> It is true that we find this independent student of the character, "round which so much revolves," saying that "whatever the defects of Columbus's mental constitution, the finger of the historian will find it difficult to point to a single blemish in his moral character." And "we find him further saying that whether we contemplate his character in his public or private relations, in all its features it wears the same noble aspects. It was in perfect harmony with the grandeur of his plans, and with results more stupendous than those which heaven has permitted any other mortal to achieve."<sup>2</sup> Mr. Prescott was something of a scholar and critic, and won the respect of several men of character, and yet Mr. Winsor charges him with flagrant untruthfulness. "It is certainly difficult," are Mr. Winsor's words, "to point to a more flagrant disregard of truth" than Prescott was guilty of, in the passage just quoted. We are more than ever positive that much of pastime revolves about the Cambridge "historian."

To Humboldt, as the student of "completed truth" calls von Humboldt, our author shows a patronizing spirit of consideration, though he is careful to advise us that even "the learned German" was unfitted to form any true estimate of Columbus. The great naturalist pays many a warm tribute to the Admiral's love of nature, and to his remarkable powers of observation and of description. But "the fact was that Humboldt transferred to his hero something of the superlative love of nature that he himself experienced in the same regions; there was all the difference between him and Columbus that there is between a genuine love of nature and a commercial use of it."<sup>3</sup> In this sentence, the discrimination of the learned American is superlatively exhibited, and his critical acumen, as well as the lucidity of his expression, must appal those who are not snickering.

Without the aid of Mr. Henry Harrisse's researches, Mr. Winsor says that it would have been quite impossible for him "to have reached conclusions on a good many mooted points in the history of the Admiral and of his reputation." Still, there are spots on some demigods, and Harrisse, not being Winsor, must have faults. "He is a good deal addicted to hypotheses, but they fare hard at his hands if advanced by others."<sup>4</sup> Mr. Harrisse deserves a criticism more severe than Mr. Winsor is capable of writing. Rev. L. A. Dutto has shown that the author of "*Christophe Colomb*" is addicted to more than hypotheses, and that there are many mooted points on which he has reached conclusions that are groundless.<sup>5</sup> However, it will be satisfactory to unpastime readers

<sup>1</sup> Winsor, p. 58.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 503.

<sup>5</sup> See *Catholic World*, February, March, April, 1892.

<sup>2</sup> Winsor, p. 501.

<sup>4</sup> Winsor, p. 52.

to know that Mr. Winsor could not have done what he has done without the aid of one who is "a good deal addicted to hypotheses."

For Roselly de Lorgues, Mr. Winsor has so fine a contempt that he couples the Frenchman's name with Irving's. And here we feel bound to credit Mr. Winsor with a phenomenal power of sarcasm,—a power which he does not always use moderately. De Lorgues's character as a historian our American mental athlete annihilates under the crushing epithet of "canonizer," or the still more deadly term, "sympathizer." Indeed, he hurls these Titanic word-boulders at all those who, living vainly, differ with him. What an awful power may be stored in one puny hand! Mr. Winsor should be merciful.

Against M. de Lorgues he has a special grievance. The French writer said, "that if we cannot believe in the supernatural we cannot understand this worldly man."<sup>1</sup> M. de Lorgues should not have said this, and he did not say this. He may have said that if we cannot believe in the supernatural we cannot understand Columbus; and saying this M. de Lorgues stated a "completed truth." But Mr. Winsor, who perhaps wishes us to know that he is not a believer in the supernatural, or who perhaps is humorously posing as a "philosopher," makes an end of the "sympathizer" with one cutting sentence: "Columbus was a mundane verity." The conclusion draws itself. What has the supernatural to do with a "mundane verity?" And where is the mundane verity that Mr. Winsor, fearless of the daze of demigods, cannot understand?—unless, of course, Mr. Harris should decide there are no mundane verities at all. Thus, with remorseless pestle, the critical researcher macerates contemporary and predecessor in his world-wide and inch-deep mortar. Behold the "scientific" school! he cries. Look ye upon the fearless, the only representative of historical research!

Taking Mr. Winsor seriously, a serious critic would surely set him down as not merely pretentious, but also as one of the most ludicrous pretenders that has ever written about Columbus. Reading laboriously his ill-ordered, ill-written book, we are reminded of his own words: "His arrogant spirit led him to magnify his importance before he had proved it; and he failed in the modesty which marks a conquering spirit." Mr. Winsor's deficiencies of intellect and of education are so apparent, that modesty would have been more becoming to him than this arrogant spirit of self-magnification. His importance he has proved sufficiently.

Mr. Irving, Mr. Prescott, could write their own language cor-

---

<sup>1</sup> Winsor, p. 54.

rectly. M. Roselly de Lorgues is equally well educated. Mr. HARRISSE, like von Humboldt, has a fair command of two languages. A critic who would compare with these men should be able to write at least one language as well as a dull school-boy of twelve. We have no stomach for the work, but perhaps some friend of good English will be tempted to gather from Mr. Winsor's book all the barbarous paragraphs and sentences with which it is "heedlessly embellished." The volume will be as great a curiosity as the famous "English, How She Is Spoke." A few choice selections we may quote here :

In 1492, Columbus, "a disheartened wanderer, his mule plodding the road to Cordoba, offered a sad picture to the few adherents whom he had left behind. They had grown to have his grasp of confidence, but lacked his spirit to clothe an experimental service with all the certainties of an accomplished fact." Their growth to his grasp we appreciate, but their fatal lack of spirit to clothe, we have not grown to grasp. However, it was with this lack of spirit that they visited the queen. Before her they proceeded to paint pictures: "The vision once fixed in the royal eye, spread under the warmth of description, into succeeding glimpses of increasing splendor. Finally the warmth and glory of an almost realized expectation filled the cabinet." Naturally, a messenger was forthwith sent after Columbus, and speedily grew to grasp him. "There was a moment's hesitancy, as thoughts of cruel and suspended feelings in the past came over him" . . . . Shaking off the suspended feelings of the past, he turned his plodding mule. "Columbus was sought once more, and in a way to give him the vantage which his imperious demands could easily use."<sup>1</sup> The condition of the "royal eye" the most unsympathetic reader will pity. Imagine a vision fixed in your plebeian eye, and spreading into succeeding glimpses; while the warmth and glory of an expectation filled your cabinet! But why, under any circumstances, should Columbus have been sought in a way to vantage imperious demands that he could easily use? The secret Mr. Winsor discloses years after the mysterious facts above narrated. "He had always reached a coign of vantage in his personal intercourse with the queen;"<sup>2</sup> carried a coign with him, we surmise. It is the "modest" architect of these sentences who says of Columbus: "He wrote as easily as people of rapid impulse do, when they are not restrained by habits of orderly deliberation. He has left us a mass of jumbled thoughts and experiences, which, unfortunately, often perplex the historian, *while they of necessity aid him.*"<sup>3</sup> Heigh-ho! Let us be merry! All the perplexing jumblerers shall be duly restrained by orderly deliberation,—in good time.

<sup>1</sup> Winsor, p. 179.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 409.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1.



In descriptive passages, Mr. Winsor is seductive, graceful, and often dangerously bewitching. Witness the psychologico-poetical description of the departure of Columbus on the second voyage. "There were cavalier and priest, hidalgo and artisan, soldier and sailor. The ambitious thoughts which animated them were as various as their habits. There were *those* of the adventurer . . . . There was the brooding of the administrators, with unsolved problems of *new communities in their heads*. There were ears that already caught the songs of salvation from native throats. There was Columbus himself. . . . To his ears the hymns of the Church soared with a militant warning, dooming the heathen of the Indies, and appalling the Moslem hoards that imperilled the Holy Sepulchre."<sup>1</sup> Shade of Irving! There *are* ears, indeed!

The scene changes. The anti-canonizer, on his way to welcome Bobadilla, whispers to us: "The queen had been faithful, but the recurrent charges had given of late a wrench to her constancy."<sup>2</sup> A member of the "scientific school" may yet find this historical wrench. If so, the Harvard Library will, perhaps, receive an addition to its treasures. Many lucid, logical, unimpulsive passages we evade, in order to quote Mr. Winsor's judgment on the well-known letter of Columbus to Doña Juana de la Torre. "While its ejaculatory statements are not well calculated to impose on the sober historian, there was enough of fervor laid against its background of distressing humility to work on the sympathies of its recipient, and of the queen, to whom it was early and naturally revealed."<sup>3</sup> Of the foreground of this epistle, there is not a syllable. Is there somebody who can scientifically determine how much fervor must be laid against the background of an ejaculatorily humble, argumentative letter, in order to work on a recipient's sympathies? We question whether a sober historian could solve the problem. And yet there is such a thing as guessing; and Mr. Winsor knows more about it than most men. When the discoverer of America reached the line of no variation his attention was awakened. "To an observer of Columbus's quick perceptions," our critic says, "there was a ready guess to possess his mind."<sup>4</sup> Argal, we maintain, there may be a ready guess to possess another's mind, and thus to observe the enoughness of the lay of fervor against the before-mentioned epistolary background.

Do we run the slightest risk of contradiction in saying that if Mr. Winsor is not humorous he is "verging on" idiocy, as he would put it, or idiotic, to speak plainly? The extracts we have made are not the most puerile in the book. And yet here is a man who cannot write a clear, correct sentence; who cannot logi-

<sup>1</sup> Winsor, p. 265.<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 393.<sup>3</sup> Winsor, p. 408.<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 201.

cally connect sentence with sentence; who does not know the meaning of words,—and therefore has no power of analysis,—and who, seriously presents himself before the public as a scientific, critical historian! Many of his defects could not be corrected in the most thorough school. His mind is confused, wobbling, by nature. This confusion is shown in the form of his sentences, in the collocation of the different parts of speech, in the inconsequences of which he is profuse, in the “flaccidity” of his statement, in the “body-swelling” rhetoric; in the vacuous judgments, in the laughable mixture of figures of speech. The history of American literature offers nothing so amusing as the attempt of Mr. Winsor to lift himself above Irving and Prescott, men of natural parts, rarely gifted, well educated, cultivated; men of taste, having an agreeable style; and, withal, modest men.

A reviewer in the “Catholic World,”<sup>1</sup> honors our American “scientist” by suggesting that he is a second Froude. The name becomes him in one sense only. Mr. Froude always pleads a cause, regardless of the right or wrong involved. Facts he will misstate, suppress, if misstatement or suppression suit his purpose. Throughout the world, his name is a synonym for “a flagrant disregard of truth.” In fact his school is quite as scientific as Mr. Winsor’s.

From the first paragraph of the first page, we see Mr. Winsor’s case, and the methods he will adopt. The assumption of superiority, the claims to learning, to critical ability, to comprehensive study, to acquaintance with “original” sources, while they evidence the childishness of his mind, are at the same time a proof that, if he be in real earnest, he hopes to have only ignorant readers, and to carry them by his want of modesty.

In his book, there is not a single fact stated that is not known to every one who has an acquaintance with the Columbus literature. He has only hackneyed material at hand, and like a hack he uses it. There is not in his book a suggestion of any value; nor a thought of any value. Indeed, we do not hesitate to say that Mr. Winsor has never had, and will never have, a thought of any value. Against Columbus he has not devised a single new charge. Every one of the charges he repeats at second, third, tenth hand, has been answered by men of mind, of honesty, and of scholarship. From one end of his volume to the other there is no sign of scholarship. In the body of his text he mentions, and occasionally quotes authorities, but he gives no proof of having consulted any of them. He has not committed himself by reference to any page of any edition; and “there are ear”-marks,

---

<sup>1</sup> January, 1892.

as he might say, that whoever gathered his material did not always have "originals" open before him. A scholar does not work after this fashion. And no intelligent student wastes time on "histories" thus manufactured. Centuries will come and go before Mr. Winsor shall have evolved into an original authority.

Indeed, the author's assumption to be *the* representative of his school is not gracious. This honor belongs to Mr. Eugene Lawrence, and we are not surprised that, in an article,<sup>1</sup> which shows all the scholarship that could be expected from a "tertiary" man, the scientific Lawrence does not breathe the name of Winsor. The attempt to rob Mr. Lawrence of laurels hard-earned, deserved this timely, this scathing rebuke. How important Mr. Lawrence deems the controlling foot-note, his article shows. He will refer, with particularity, to books he has not read, and perhaps has never seen. Of course, this kind of "science" is sure to confound a man when least he expects it; but the scholarly habit is commendable, even when abused.

Through Mr. Lawrence, who has profitably exploited the field of "scientific" history for many years, we trace the development of Mr. Winsor back to Mr. Aaron Goodrich, the founder of the North American "scientifico-critical" anti-Columbus school. Of his historical grandfather, Mr. Winsor speaks slightly. Not only does he join Mr. Goodrich's name with that of the "canonizer," de Lorgues, but he says that Goodrich entered upon his work with the determined purposed of making a scamp of the *great* discoverer of America.<sup>2</sup> And pray what was Mr. Winsor's purpose?—unless Mr. Harris should discover that our author had no purpose at all. "They each" (de Lorgues and Goodrich) "in their twists, pervert and emphasize every trait and every incident to favor their views." And we add that "he each," in his twists, like Mr. Lawrence, in his twists, is chargeable with the same perversion. Goodrich's book, like that of de Lorgues, is "absolutely worthless as an historical record," and "has probably done little to make proselytes," writes Mr. Winsor. Poor Mr. Winsor forgets that he will say of Irving that "he does not know when he is criticizing himself."

Mr. Goodrich had more brains than Mr. Winsor, and perhaps, as nice a conscience. Saying all that his critic says against Columbus, Goodrich said something more. Mr. Winsor pictures a scamp for us; but he lacks the courage of Goodrich, who carried the "scientific" method to a logical conclusion. Were he to edit his critic's volume, he would cut out all the "seems" and "perhaps," leaving a thinner book, as well as the mean scamp that Mr.

<sup>1</sup> *Vide Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, May, 1892, pp. 728-740.

<sup>2</sup> Winsor, p. 60.



Winsor would have "limned," were he as "scientific" as either Goodrich, or Lawrence. As the school evolves, it is not, apparently, the fittest that survive.

The spirit which directed Mr. Winsor in his undertaking, and the peculiar qualities of his critical mind, will be the better appreciated through some helpful quotation. Speaking of the French biographies of Columbus, "which have been aimed to prepare the way for the canonization of the great navigator, in recognition of his instrumentality in carrying the cross to the New World," the American says that they emphasize the missionary spirit of Columbus. "That, in the spirit which characterized the age of discovery, the voyage of Columbus was, at least in profession, held to be one primarily for that end does not, certainly, admit of dispute. Columbus himself, in his letter to Sanchez, speaks of the rejoicing of Christ at seeing the future redemption of souls. He made a first offering of the foreign gold by converting a mass of it into a cup *to hold the sacred host*, and he spent a wordy enthusiasm in promise of a new crusade to wrest the holy sepulchre from the Moslems . . . Professions, however, were easy; faith is always exuberant under success, and the world, and even the Catholic world, learned as the ages went on, to look upon the spirit that put the poor heathen beyond the pale of humanity as not particularly sanctifying a pioneer of devastation. It is the world's misfortune when a great opportunity loses any of its dignity; and it is no great satisfaction to look upon a person of Columbus's environments and find him but a creature of questionable grace."<sup>1</sup> Incredible as it may appear, the author of the balderdash just quoted, criticizing Hubert Howe Bancroft's rehearsal of the story of Columbus, writes that: "It is, unfortunately, not altogether chaste in its literary presentation."<sup>2</sup> O vestal Winsor! Thou almost too chaste literary presentator! Would that thou hadst never compelled us to assault thy virginal coign of vantage!

The mission of Columbus is certain, indisputable, "at least in profession." The last four words are wholly "scientific." The discoverer mentioned Christ and the redemption of souls in one of his letters. This is true; but it is also true that he made the same mention in many of his writings; as it is also true that the sovereigns made like mention in several of their writings. These facts have to do with the question. Why does Mr. Winsor scientifically suppress them? Why the idiotic: "faith is always exuberant *under* success," and the drivel about the spirit that did not "particularly sanctify a pioneer of devastation?" From the whole

---

<sup>1</sup> Winsor, pp. 52-53.

<sup>2</sup> Winsor, p. 59.

quotation a ready guess possesses our mind that Winsor's Columbus is to be a hypocrite, a pioneer of devastation, and, like all scamps, a creature of questionable grace.

After a time we are told that "Columbus was chronically given to looseness of statement." Mr. Winsor does not tell the truth about Columbus in this sentence; but, inserting his own name in place of the name of Columbus, Mr. Winsor will have made an honest confession. We have passed over one of his falsifications. Now we call attention to it. The French biographies to which he refers have *not* "been aimed at preparing the way for the canonization of the great navigator." How could any one, other than Mr. Winsor, aim a biography at preparing a way? The French biographies were written to correct the misstatements, the calumnies which certain Americans would revive. The French writers could not but emphasize the missionary spirit of Columbus. That spirit is certain; and only a coward would try to rob the discoverer of the glory he has won through his apostolic zeal.

However, when Mr. Winsor aimed at preparing his own dreary way, he aimed around a corner, as we know from the following quotation: "In 1501, his mind—the mind of Columbus—was verging on irresponsibility. He had a talent for deceit, and sometimes boasted of it, or at least counted it a merit." In the name of sense, what is the meaning of "verging on irresponsibility?" Let us answer for the author. In order to make a scamp of Columbus, it is necessary that Mr. Winsor should have the most perfect freedom in loose statement. To have this freedom, he feels it necessary to charge Columbus with looseness of statement and with deceit. Thus the author can accept or reject the words of Columbus, wherever the author pleases. Furthermore, the supernatural is especially emphasized,—and so emphasized that a "critic" cannot cover it, avoid it,—in the writings of Columbus after 1500. Hence the importance of "verging" him on irresponsibility in 1501 at least. The discriminating Mr. Winsor, as best suits his purpose, will thus be free, at the proper date, to make the discoverer responsible and irresponsible on the same page. Clever Mr. Winsor! This must be "science"; but suppose your critics should grow to grasp your scheme!

The maladroït author has, presumably, fixed upon 1501 as the date of the "verge" of Columbus; but, in fixing upon this date Mr. Winsor did not protect himself sufficiently. Telling the story of Columbus and the so-called Junta of Salamanca, he lauds the Genoese because he "stood manfully for the light that was in him."

---

<sup>1</sup> Winsor, p. 83.

Promptly, however, we are advised of "those pitiful aberrations of intellect which, *in the years following*, took possession of him, and which were constantly reiterated with painful and maundering wailing."<sup>1</sup> The Junta of Salamanca met in the winter of 1486-1487; and here we have a statement that the aberrations "took possession" of Columbus in the years following. We are no longer bound by the date 1501. Of course this method of writing history may be scientific; but it is not a common-sense method. It is the method of Mr. Lawrence as exemplified in his doomful "Mystery."

Notwithstanding the pitiful aberrations "of the years succeeding," Columbus won over the queen five years after the meeting at Salamanca. Listen to Mr. Winsor's blank verse: "The Christian banner of Spain floated over the Moorish palace. The kingdom was alive in all its provinces." What a kingdom it must have been! "Congratulation and jubilation, with glitter and vauntings pervaded the air."<sup>2</sup> We have a Milton among us. "Columbus was indeed to succeed; but his success was an error in geography, and a failure in policy and morals."<sup>3</sup> The beautiful "but!" Need we add that Columbus never wrote a sentence that showed as great aberration of intellect, as does the sentence we have taken from Mr. Winsor.

"When," after the second voyage, "Columbus landed at Cadiz (June 11, 1496), he was clothed with the robe and girdled with the cord of the Franciscans. *His face was unshaven*. Whether *this* was in penance, or an assumption of piety to serve as a lure is not clear. Oviedo says it was to express his humility, and his humbled pride needed some such expression."<sup>4</sup> At length we have some truly scientific history. To Mr. Winsor an apology is due. He has confounded us with an original idea,—the idea of an unshaven face in penance, or serving as a pious lure. The man whose success was an error in geography, undoubtedly "needed some such expression." True Science! unshaven, humbly, unluringly, we beg your pardon.

After this experience we cannot feel surprised when Mr. Winsor repeatedly charges Columbus with wiliness. "His artfulness never sprang to a new device so exultingly as when it was a method of increasing the revenue at the cost of the natives."<sup>5</sup> Now this is lucid, and the figure is sweet and lovable; but we opine that the character of Columbus would be more completely understood of the people, were some one of our artists to treat this subject in chiaroscuro, and exhibit his work at the coming Chicago Expo-

<sup>1</sup> Winsor, p. 164.

<sup>2</sup> Winsor, p. 176.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 177.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 325.

<sup>5</sup> Winsor, p. 371.



sition: "Columbus's Artfulness Exultingly Springing At a New Device." By the way, this is Mr. Winsor's second original thought. Penitentially unshaven, we must, we shall remain.

The aberration of Columbus we know something of; and it is now time that we learned of a worse disorder which the critical school has diagnosed. He was subject to hallucinations. Indeed, according to Mr. Winsor, when the discoverer was not aberrating, he was hallucinating. "His mind was not unfrequently, in no fit condition to ward off hallucination." Now, as we gather from our scientist, the agonies of such spirits are painful. How painful, he tells us in moving words: "It is far easier to let one's self loose into the vortex and be tossed with sympathy." And now, patient readers, may we not ask you to let yourselves loose into the vortex,—say for five minutes,—and be tossed with sympathy for the critical Mr. Winsor? He needs vortices of the most tossful sympathy. Were it not that he is so acutely discriminating, we should describe him, in his own dialect, as "in large part tumultuous, incoherent, harrowing, weakening and sad,"—"an exultant and bewildered being, singularly compounded."<sup>1</sup>

Our critic considers it fortunate, as we do, that during the latter years of his life Columbus wrote a number of letters. Mr. Winsor values these letters because, with their aid, he can trace the various mental moods of the discoverer. How a great critic estimates these valuable documents may be inferred from the following sentence: "They have in their entirety a good deal of that haphazard jerkiness tiresome to read, and not easily made evident in abstract." If this be so, then Mr. Winsor is *the* man, among all men, fated to jerk the tiresomeness out of their entirety, and to make it haphazardly evident in abstract and in concrete. Honestly, we have labored to take Mr. Winsor seriously; but who could? No one, we are certain, unless it be the undazed historian's self.

Hoping for an "increase of revenue at the cost of the natives," many writers have ventured to compose "history" in the serious or in the comic vein. It would be unfair to suggest that the "scientific" school could be influenced by a motive so veritably mundane. What then could have tempted our author to write his book? If we except himself, Lawrence and Goodrich; if we consult those who, from Bernaldez to Goodrich, told the story of Columbus, we find among honorable, intelligent and studious men, a remarkable agreement as to the ability and character of the discoverer of America. He was a genius; a man of high mind, of great soul, of extraordinary sensibility, gifted with quick percep-

---

<sup>1</sup> Winsor, p. 461.

tion, with the imagination of a poet, with rare patience, with splendid courage. Add to these admirable qualities his earnest, humble faith in Christ, his devout habits, his zeal in the cause of religion, his loyalty to his adopted country, and certainly he grows not less but greater. And thus all men, who know in what true greatness consists, have judged. Why should Mr. Winsor have wasted effort, seriously or humorously—but in either case, maunderingly—in the attempt to fill in a scant outline with colors that limn a spirit-of-his-age hypocrite, an exuberant pioneer of devastation, a talented deceiver, of questionable grace, an unshaven lure, an aberrating hallucinator, and a successful geographical error? Only “science” dare answer: “True science, which places no gratulations higher than its own conscience.”<sup>1</sup>

Quoting from Mr. Winsor, we shall let science speak for herself. “To find illustrations in any inquiry is not so difficult if you select what you wish, and discard all else, and the result of this discriminating accretion often looks very plausible.”<sup>2</sup> Discriminating! We think we have already heard the word out of Mr. Winsor’s mouth. And now that science is on our side, we feel encouraged to say that he is only an accretor and a selecting discarder—though not plausible. Let us follow the accretor as he “finds illustrations” in his “inquiry” about Columbus. De Lorques is the subject of Mr. Winsor’s criticism. Thus he writes: “Every act and saying of the Admiral capable of subserving the purpose in view are simply made the salient points of a career assumed to be holy. Columbus was in fact of a piece, in this respect, with the age in which he lived. The official and officious religious profession of the time belonged to a period which invented the Inquisition and extirpated a race in order to send them to heaven.”<sup>3</sup> This passage might be quoted under the “comicalities,” or the “idiocies” of Mr. Winsor. We quote it here to show his hatred of the faith of Columbus, his ignorance of that faith, and his calumniating spirit. In the age in which Columbus lived, calumniators often felt the lash, and fools, in or out of the court, were not always spared because they wore a cap and jingled bells.

And now let us “discriminate” with our scientist while he portrays in our presence a mundane verity who was “of a piece” with Columbus—a yard-stick figure!—and of the age in which he lived—King Ferdinand. “If the Pope regarded him from Italy, *that* Holy Father called him pious. The modern student finds him a bigot.” The modern “student,” be sure, is our accretor. “His subjects thought him great and glorious, *but* they did not see his dispatches, nor know his sometimes baleful domination in his cabi-

<sup>1</sup> Winsor, p. 177.

<sup>2</sup> Winsor, p. 129.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 54.

net. The French would not trust him. The English watched his ambition. The Moors knew him as their conqueror." Great minds had the Moors! "The Jews fled before his evil eye. The miserable saw him in his inquisitors. *All* this pleased the Pope, and the papal will made him, in preferred phrase, His Most Catholic Majesty." . . . Discard the animus shown against the papacy, and the quotation is valueless, except as a further example of Mr. Winsor's painful maundering. But he will not cease until he has emphasized his ignorance as well as his prejudice. Ferdinand "did not extort money; he only extorted agonized confessions. He said masses, and prayed equally well for God's benediction on evil as on good things. He made promises, and then got the papal dispensation to break them."<sup>1</sup> Justin! Justin! Is there a Justin Fulton? Then there are two of them.

Mr. Winsor's book, we judge, has been adapted so that, should the occasion offer, it may be advertised as a sequel to "Uncle Tom's Cabin." In and out of season, the question of slavery is made an excuse for another dreary page. An example of the rhetoric, we give with a purpose. "The contemporary history of that age may be said to ring with the wails and moans of such Negro and Moorish victims. A Holy religion had unblushingly been made the sponsor for such a crime. Theologians had proved that the Word of God could ordain misery in this world, if only the recompense came—or be supposed to come—in a passport to the Christian's heaven."<sup>2</sup> Perhaps "Science" can lie as fast as a horse can trot. If so, then "Science" wrote the words we have quoted.

We have some notion, now, of Mr. Winsor's measure of the age in which Columbus lived, and of the "light that was in him." The "completed truth" is yet to come. "That Columbus was a devout Catholic, according to the Catholicism of his epoch, does not admit of question, but when tried by any test that finds the perennial in holy acts, Columbus fails to bear examination. He had nothing of the generous and noble spirit of a conjoint lover of man and of God, as the higher spirits of all times have developed it. There was no all-loving Deity in his conception. His Lord was one in whose name it was convenient to practice enormities. He shared this subterfuge with Isabella *and the rest*."<sup>3</sup> And with due reverence to Our Lord, we ask, what kind of a Lord can he be, that this convenient utterer of shameless enormities claims as his? For him, it were a charity to say, what, calculatingly, he says of Columbus: "There is no excuse but the plea of insanity."<sup>4</sup>

The doltish ignorance of this perennial "higher spirit" of our

<sup>1</sup> Winsor, pp. 160, 161.

<sup>3</sup> Winsor, p. 505.

<sup>2</sup> Winsor, p. 311.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 511.



time, was exhibited in the statement that Columbus made an offering of a cup to hold the sacred "host." For the sacraments of the Catholic Church, confession, the holy communion, extreme unction, he shows that unreasoning hate, which betokens a spirit less pardonable than ignorance. The clergy he calumniates, not hesitating to embody in his text suggestions that are basely made, because wholly unfounded.<sup>1</sup> To lie by suggestion, in the name of a Deity, is perhaps to be all-loving, in Mr. Winsor's conception; but in the conception of ordinary men, the lie suggestive is the meanest of lies. Mr. Winsor's "unstinted denunciatory purpose," to use his own eloquent words about Mr. Goodrich, is "much weakened by an inconsiderate rush of disdain";<sup>2</sup> but none the less should his purpose and his ignorance be exposed. He pretends to write the life of a Catholic, and to present a picture of an age wholly Catholic, while knowing of Catholicity no more than a Carib. Go to school, sir! and when you can write clean sentences, take, if you please, to cataloguing books! The ignorance and hate of Lawrence and of Goodrich will be perennial without you. The scientific Mr. Huxley, whose pretentiousness you affect, some Catholics may take seriously; but a counterfeit of his protoplasmic Bathybius even though it develop into the form of a librarian, they will remorselessly, smilingly stew into nothingness.

A passion for "completed truth" compels us to make still another extract from our "subterfugeous" author. The year 1501, he first fixed as the date of the discoverer's hallucination. Then the years following 1486-87 were mentioned as years of aberration. These aberrations and hallucinations were made out of whole cloth, by Mr. Winsor, in order that he might, in a wily way, diminish the credit of Columbus, and yet partly conceal Mr. Winsor's unbelief in the supernatural. However, a man of his little wits finds it much easier to be wily than to be wise, as the following paragraph demonstrates: "He naturally lost his friends with losing his manly devotion to a cause. I do not find the beginning of this surrender of his manhood earlier than in the will which he signed *February 22, 1498*, when he credits the Holy Trinity with having inspired him with the idea that one could go to the Indies by passing westward."<sup>3</sup> The murder is out! And we have detected the motive that prompted a tame librarian to attempt to assassinate the character of Christopher Columbus. In his ignorant hate of the Catholic religion, he would make it appear, at one time, that an incomparable genius was mad, because he expressed his belief in the supernatural, and at another time, that this genius unmanned himself by crediting the Holy Trinity—that lives and

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 184, 362, 490, 508, among others.

<sup>2</sup> Winsor, p. 504.

<sup>3</sup> Winsor, p. 511.

reigns forever, without end,—with having inspired him with the idea of seeking a new world. There we have the American scientific-critical school, body and bones, limned in truest proportion by one of its most learned, intellectual and artistic representatives! An abiding faith in the Holy Trinity unmans! On the same page with this atrocious expression of unbelief, it is fitting that a Catholic, in the name of believers, should laud the Trinity that the Catholic Columbus always venerated and loved: Praise be to the Most Holy Trinity, for the inspiration mercifully vouchsafed to the humble Genoese; and for the inspirations daily vouchsafed to men of faith!

Whether Mr. Winsor be a serious or a comic historian, we have his measure of bigotry, imbecility, impertinence, ignorance, wiliness, and "flagrant disregard of truth." The spirits of Irving, Prescott, von Humboldt, may rest peacefully. Paraphrasing his own words, true historical science has written Mr. Justin Winsor's epitaph: He was a blunderer; his blunder was a book; the book is his monument!<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Charles Kendall Adams, formerly President of Cornell University, and who recently, we believe, was transferred to a western college, is responsible for a work, in every way more modest than Mr. Winsor's.<sup>2</sup> From the pages of Mr. Adams it would not be difficult to make a collection of sentences almost as laughable as Mr. Winsor's. However, the book is much less bad than the "scientist's," and, having said this, there is nothing more to be said in its favor. Indeed, without being brilliant, a writer could have made the "Christopher Columbus" of the ex-President of Cornell out of the Librarian's volume. The book shows signs of haste, not pardonable in a biographer who identifies himself with "modern research."<sup>3</sup> We find a reference to a historian, Von Concelos by name. Perhaps modern research has modified the old form, Vasconcelles, or *ellos*. And we read at least ten times of one "Agnado." The antique school called this: Aguado. Of course, the proof-reader is to blame; but a writer who pretends to judge a great man should be careful lest, through evident carelessness in his work, he give a reader cause to doubt his thoroughness. Mr. Adams will acknowledge that, since Luther's coming, the world has grown more "critical." By the way, the friar who befriended Columbus was known to his contemporaries as Perez, and not as Parez. Finical, if you please; but then there are "eternal verities," as Mr. Adams suggests. Shall we not apply them to him?

<sup>1</sup> Winsor, p. 512.

<sup>2</sup> *Christopher Columbus, His Life and His Work*. New York. 1892.

<sup>3</sup> Adams, p. 73.

Mr. Adams is clumsy, but not bitter. He is not so illogical as Mr. Winsor, though his mind was evidently formed in the same school. In statement and in judgment, he is apt to be contradictory. The religious motive of Columbus he does not hide; yet he quietly puts it aside and seeks to minimize it and him by the stock suggestion of "a distracted, if not an unbalanced mind." Indeed, we are inclined to enter the name of Mr. Adams on the roll of the "scientific" school. Mr. Harris has claimed that if Columbus had not discovered America in 1492, some one else would have discovered it on a certain day some eight years later. Mr. Winsor's mind saltated at this charmingly critical and logical argument, and Mr. Adams also makes it his own. Through an oversight, we neglected to say that, like Mr. Winsor, Mr. Adams is his own authority. He mentions other writers, but always without reference. This method facilitates historical composition, as it permits the composer to introduce quotations from authorities, regardless of the application which the quoted texts have in the original. A shrewd Frenchman said that, having eight lines of anybody's handwriting, it was an easy matter to ruin the writer. How easy it should be then to ruin Columbus, out of a "haphazard" compilation from eighty volumes written by other men! Mr. Adams sins particularly in his quotations from Las Casas, an author who has been sadly abused by all the "scientists." Beyond the misapplication of quotations, we regret to say that, in the translation of texts, Mr. Adams occasionally violates the "eternal verities." However, as we understand the matter, he is their private keeper, and doubtless is entitled to handle them according to his own sweet will.

As evidence substantiating our view that Mr. Adams belongs to the "scientific" school, and as proof that we do not misjudge his logical powers, we shall make a few short extracts from his volume. Having set forth, somewhat weakly, a certain number of hypotheses which lead him to think that Columbus did only what some one else might have done afterwards, Mr. Adams says: "But none of these facts should detract from the credit of Columbus. The great man of such a time is the one who shows that he knows the law of development, and, bringing all possible knowledge to his service, works with a lofty courage and an unflagging persistency and enthusiasm for the object of his devotion, in accordance with the strict laws of historical sequence. Such was the method of Columbus."<sup>1</sup> Mr. Adams may be able to develop sense out of this curious concatenation of the different parts of speech; but others will not be so fortunate. What is the "law of development" of "*such* a time?" And how is a man to know

---

<sup>1</sup> Adams, p. 33.



this law, which we may imagine to be in the same box with the "eternal verities," and thus hidden from profane eyes? The use of the term "law of development" marks Mr. Adams as an evolutionary factor in the American school of "scientific" historians—a school easily distinguishable by its use of meaningless terms and by a splendid contempt for the great "law of intelligibility." What are "the strict laws of historical sequence," of which Mr. Adams makes mention? They must also be in the "verities" box. Why will not our "historian" favor the world with an English version of these important laws? The idea of Columbus knowing the law of development and then working methodically according to the laws of historical sequence, is worthy of Mr. Winsor himself. There is a law of common sense, which, if Mr. Adams will master it, may keep him from writing "bosh."

And there is another law, the great law of logical sequence, of which this keeper of the eternal verities has never heard, perhaps. A test of his logical power, critical acumen, and hence of his fitness for the office of an historian, can be made by analyzing a few sentences taken from his book. "It is not easy to establish a standard by which to judge of a man whose life was in an age that is past. In defiance of all scholarship, the judgments of critics continue to differ in regard to Alexander, Julius Cæsar, and even Frederick the Great and Napoleon."<sup>1</sup> Why, in the second of these sentences, does Mr. Adams put the words "and even?" In the first sentence he has stated a general proposition: "It is not easy to fix a standard by which to judge a man who died before our time. To this proposition we agree, with many qualifications. The argument, however, is that of Mr. Adams. Frederick, Napoleon, are as dead as Julius Cæsar. Their ages have passed. Therefore, it is not easy to fix a standard by which to judge "of" them. The "and even" is out of place; it means nothing more than that the thought of Mr. Adams is not clear. Next we take the words: "In defiance of all scholarship." They are out of place. The general proposition of Mr. Adams implies that, with or without scholarship, it is not easy to judge a man of a past age, and hence that critics will differ about dead men. Therefore, the differences of the critics are not "in defiance of scholarship." It is Mr. Adams who is defiant of logic. Several trains of thought were running through his mind. He should have switched them on to their respective tracks. Not doing so, a collision occurred and a wreck, not creditable to him.

However, at times, the best of men will make a mistake. To judge "of" the logical or illogical habits of Mr. Adams from two

---

<sup>1</sup> Adams, p. 251.

sentences only would not be fair. We shall quote the sentence following the two quoted above: "On the one hand, nothing can be more unjust than to bring to the judgment of the present age a man whose activities were exerted amid surroundings and influences that have long since changed and passed away; while, on the other, nothing is more unsafe than to regard the opinions of contemporaries as the just and final judgment of humanity." Between this sentence and the preceding sentence, beginning, "In defiance of scholarship," there is no connection. Nor is there a logical connection between it and the sentence beginning, "It is not easy." Probably, Mr. Adams imagined that he was developing his original proposition, but his error is apparent. Now, if we take the new sentence as it is, and analyze it, we find a form that implies the balancing of things alike or unlike: "On the one hand," "On the other hand." And yet there is no resemblance or contrast, between "injustice" and "unsafeness." A backward child might be pardoned for writing after this fashion, using forms regardless of sense and words regardless of their meaning or relation, but a "scientific" historian should do better.

The ideas expressed in the sentence last quoted deserve a moment's attention. We shall try to state them clearly. First, it is unjust to judge a man of a past age by the judgment of our age. We guess at the writer's meaning, and we might reasonably say yes, or no, to the proposition. Coming, however, to the "other hand" clause of the sentence, we cannot pass it without exposing its unsafeness. To regard the opinions of contemporaries as the just and final judgment of humanity is not safe, says Mr. Adams. An opinion is not a certainty, we agree; but, Mr. Adams has been speaking of judgments, and the word "opinions" is out of place. Let him stick to his text. If he meant to say that it is unsafe to accept the judgments of contemporaries as just and final, not only did he mean to state an untruth, but we shall prove his error by his own words. It *is* safe to regard as just and final the judgments of informed, honest, disinterested contemporaries who knew the person about whom, and the facts about which, they express a judgment. With his little hatchet, Mr. Adams would surreptitiously cut down the primeval oaks of tradition, and with a lean pen-handle he would overturn the rock of certitude, firm-based in the testimony of men and of the senses. It is always unsafe to accept as just and final the judgment of one not competent to judge; and safely we claim that Mr. Adams is too "scientific," and not logical enough, to form sound judgments "of" facts or thoughts.

The author continues: "Between these two dangers we must seek the basis of a judgment in those eternal verities which are

applicable to every age. Since civilization began, good men have ever recognized certain principles of right and justice as applicable to all men and all times."<sup>1</sup> Here we have another bit of "scientific" phraseology: "Since civilization began," and it is meaningless. We are not surprised that Mr. Adams, unsuspectingly, upsets his own nice little illogical argument. It is unsafe, he said, to regard the "opinions" of contemporaries as just and final. And now he tells us that there are "eternal verities" applicable to every age. These eternal verities, we presume, are the principles of right and wrong, which good men have, for an indefinite period, considered applicable to all men and all times. The eternal verities have necessarily existed in each age, and have been applicable in each age. And good men have applied them in each age. Perhaps Mr. Adams holds that, in certain ages, there were no good men; but, until he establishes the fact, we shall maintain that, by his own thoughtless words, he proves that contemporary opinions, based on the principles of right and wrong, may be just and final. How can it, then, be unsafe to regard just judgments as just and final judgments as final? However good Mr. Adams may be, according to the standard of his age, he is a loose reasoner, too illogical, too confused, to be a safe judge of men of any age.

The "eternal verities" of Mr. Adams are summed up in three questions, applicable to all men and all time: "Did his life and his work tend to the elevation of mankind? If so, did these results flow from his conscious purpose? If temporary wrong and injustice were done, were these accessory to the firmer establishment of those broad principles which must underlie all security and happiness?" What a mean set of eternal verities Mr. Adams had in the box! Good enough, no doubt, for an evolutionary "scientist"; but imagine a Christian historian thus poorly equipped with "principles of right and wrong!" Not a word of God, of law, of duty! The first "If" reminds one of Mr. Winsor's "successful error" in geography, and might be remodelled in this way: If his life and work tended to the elevation of mankind, was it not by mistake? The second "If" evidences a sublime conception of the principle of right and wrong; and is, neither more nor less than an affirmation that: The end justifies the means. The "conscious purpose" of the previous question might well have been transferred to this one. Neither conscious wrong, nor conscious injustice, can be construed as right under any circumstances, or in any age; even if a claim be made that the wrong or the injustice were "necessary to the firmer establishment of those *broad* principles which must underlie all security and happiness."

---

<sup>1</sup> Adams, p. 252.



We need not be surprised if we find this "broad-principle" historian freely applying his three "eternal verities" to Columbus. In a halting, uncertain way, he adopts the story so handsomely told by Mr. Eugene Lawrence, of the discoverer's early career as a pirate. Speaking of the French Vice-Admiral Coulom,<sup>1</sup> called by the Venetians, Colombo, Mr. Adams shows his lack of acquaintance with the matter, by saying that "the state-papers of the time uniformly refer to the elder of these commanders as "the Pirate Columbus."<sup>2</sup> We challenge Mr. Adams to prove this statement. Mr. Harrissee puts the whole case so clearly that no respectable historian can mention the piratical tale except to deny it. However, if Mr. Adams prefers to stand with those learned authorities, Lawrence and Goodrich, the eternal verities will be in good company.

Of the Catholic religion, Mr. Adams is quite as ignorant as Mr. Winsor. Fortunately, the limits of his book do not allow him full play. His judgment of Columbus is "of a piece" with that of the chaste New England stylist. The discoverer was greedy; a wicked slave-trader; indeed, quite "a man of his time." This is the cant of the whole "scientific school." And yet, compared with Mr. Winsor, the ex-president of Cornell University is kind to Columbus. Twice he calls him a "harbinger." We quote one of these tributes on account of its beauty: 'Columbus kindled a fire in every mariner's heart. That fire was the harbinger of a new era, for it was not to be extinguished.'<sup>3</sup> Lest the new era may be casually extinguished, we suggest to Mr. Adams that, presently, he drop his eternal verities, with the other rubbish, into the fires of several mariners' hearts,—as a harbinger.

From Irving and Prescott to Goodrich, Lawrence, Winsor and Adams, the descent is painfully notable. The older men were not Catholics, and therefore studied the great Catholic genius, and a Catholic age and country, under serious disadvantages. But being honest men, who recognized the truth of Christian principles, they approached their work with honest intent, with a due sense of responsibility, and with a measure of justice, which though imperfect, was but a little short of the true measure. The judgment of Prescott,—a judgment which every unprejudiced and intelligent student of the life of Columbus must accept,—Mr. Winsor has politely quoted for us. Comparing it with the drivel of Winsor, or the obfuscations of Mr. Adams, Americans must blush for shame that, among them, the name "historian" should be to-day so unwarrantably misused and abused.

<sup>1</sup> Called also Coulon, Colon, and Coullon; his true name was Guillaume de Casenove. See Harrissee, *Les Colombo de France et d'Italie*, pp. 180 et seq.; and *Major's Letters*, p. xxxviii.

<sup>2</sup> Adams, p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Adams, p. 257.

Mr. Irving's "Observations on the character of Columbus," based as they are on serious and unbiased study, and agreeing, as they do, with Mr. Prescott's conclusions, will always deserve and receive credit.<sup>1</sup> If Mr. Irving accused the discoverer of "superstition and bigotry," we feel that the writer's error was chargeable to a defect of vision, of which he was not conscious, and for which therefore, he should not be harshly condemned. As, with much learning, patience and art, Mr. Irving established, Columbus was a great man, in whom "the practical and the poetical were singularly combined;" a man of learning and a daring genius "whose conclusions even when erroneous were ever ingenious and splendid;" a sagacious man, quick of mind and lucid. He was unselfish. He was not avaricious. Ambitious he was, "with an ambition truly noble and lofty, instinct with high thought, and prone to generous deed." His views were grand, his spirit was magnanimous. A wise ruler, with a sound policy and liberal views, he desired to be a civilizer of men. By nature a sensitive, a passionate man, he trained himself to patience, to forbearance. Forgiving, he forgot. Nature he loved with the enthusiasm of a poet; and poetlike, he was frank in the expression of all the emotions that swept over his impressionable soul. "He was devoutly pious, religion mingled with the whole course of his thoughts and actions, and shone forth in his most private and unstudied writings." "His language was pure and guarded." "An ardent and enthusiastic imagination threw a magnificence over his whole course of thought"; and yet his nature "was controlled by powerful judgment and directed by an acute sagacity." From "the cares of penury, the neglect of a fickle public, the injustice of an ungrateful king, this wonderful man suffered bitterly." But the grandeur of his work is visible to all men. "Nations and tongues and languages have filled the earth with his renown; and to the latest posterity his name shall be revered and blessed."

In Washington Irving's analysis of the character of Columbus, there is not one word of exaggeration. To know the discoverer of America, is to admire him, to love him, to sympathize with him. How can one admire and love without warmly defending him against enemies old or new? Admirable and lovable, he deserves not only defense but also praise. Not even an honest pagan could refuse him laudation. To youth and age he may, he should be presented as an exemplar of manhood; and, with deliberation, we have called his calumniators "spiritless men."

The glory of Columbus was greater than Prescott or Irving

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus*. Hudson edition, vol. ii., pp. 584-596.

could appreciate. Only a Catholic can know, can feel the greatness of the Discoverer's soul. In the face of the American "scientific" school of historians, it is not important that we should state the claims of Leo XIII. to intellectuality, to learning, to a rare knowledge of men's minds and hearts. Perhaps the librarian, or the ex-university President, or even Mr. Lawrence might concede that the Pope was neither aberrated nor hallucinated. In Columbus he sees all that Irving saw and something more. What the Pope sees, he states precisely. "Columbus aimed first of all to propagate the name of Christian and the benefits of Christian charity in the West. As a fact, as soon as he presented himself to the sovereigns of Spain, he explained the cause for which they were not to fear taking a warm interest in the enterprise, as their glory would increase to the degree of immortality if they decided to carry the name and the doctrines of Jesus Christ into such distant regions." "Certain as he was of tracing out and of preparing the way of the Gospel, and fully absorbed in his thought, he caused all his actions to converge to it, not undertaking anything of any kind but under the shield of religion, and with the escort of piety." Doubling the world, spreading civilization and riches, and benefits innumerable, he is worthy of all honor; but honorable above all because "of his subservience and knowing obedience to the divine project."<sup>1</sup> "Elevation of heart, the spark of genius come from God only, their author and preserver." The Discoverer's acknowledgment that the Holy Trinity had inspired his work, was a Christian's humble acknowledgment of a patent fact.

The contemptible books recently written about Columbus make plain the defective scholarship, the lamentable want of logic, the low order of mind, the imperfect education of certain writers, who push themselves upon or who are pushed upon the public. Among the educated their books can do no harm; but among the uneducated, among the young, the evil they may cause is incalculable. In the field of history, Catholics should work more earnestly, more laboriously. There the cockle is sown by night. There the seeds of sham science, of false philosophy, of infidelity, are watered and tended as though they were valuable plants. And growing, they kill the fine wheat of truth. To uproot the weeds of error is to do good work. To plant the seed of truth is to do noble work. Awaken, ye sleepers!

JOHN A. MOONEY.

---

<sup>1</sup> See the letter already referred to.



## IS IRISH HOME RULE NEAR?

**A**FTER six years' rule the Tory Government has been overthrown in the British Empire, and its place has been taken by a ministry pledged to restore self-government to Ireland. For the first time in the century a majority of the British House of Commons has declared itself in favor of Ireland's right to that national government, of which she was deprived by force and fraud at its very beginning. The struggle of the Irish people for self-government has hardly a parallel in history for its persistence. Beginning with Emmett's ill-fated insurrection in 1803, it has continued under varying names down to the present moment. The struggle for Catholic Emancipation was only the prelude to O'Connell's Repeal Agitation, and that movement had no sooner been hushed by the famine and the death of its great leader than it was followed by Young Ireland's appeal to arms, in 1848. The Tenant Right Agitation of Duffy and Lucas took up the struggle only to be broken by the treachery of Kehoe and Sadlier; yet scarcely had the people resigned all hope of success from Parliamentary action than James Stephens essayed a fresh organization for armed insurrection. The Fenian attempted revolt met a similar fate to Emmett's and Smith O'Brien's, and was crushed by the force of the British Empire; but while scores of its followers were yet paying the penalty of their attempt in English and Australian convict cells, their countrymen renewed in Parliament the demand for Home Rule, which now at last has won to its side a majority of the representation of the Empire. Since O'Connell, in 1829, wrested religious freedom from the conqueror of Napoleon, no gleam of success has come to cheer the Irish people in their long national struggle. It has seen three attempted insurrections fail; its country has been wasted by a famine unparalleled in modern history, its numbers have dwindled to little more than a half of what they were fifty years ago; but all through these years the great mass of Irishmen has steadily refused to allow its nationality to be merged in that of its rulers. From the beginning of the Repeal movement down to 1885, the whole body of British Representatives, without distinction of Whig or Tory, of Conservative or Liberal, was united in the determination that the union of the two countries should be maintained at any cost. During much the greater part of that time, owing to the limited extent of the franchise, a majority of the members of Parliament from Ireland united in the same view, but the

spirit of the Irish people has never wavered in the resolution to win back self-government. Dogged perseverance at length has prevailed against the strength of English prejudice. The ablest statesman of the Empire finally acknowledged the justice of Ireland's claims, and his leadership drew the majority of the Liberal party to the same view in 1885. The old race antipathies of the English people were then too powerful to yield at once even to the influence of a Gladstone, and the cry of preserving the union of the Empire carried an aristocratic party, headed by a typical and insolent marquis, into control of the government, despite of the democratic feelings of the mass of English voters. The task of smoothing away those antipathies and of convincing the majority of the people of Great Britain that Irish Home Rule was not only just, but also expedient to the welfare of the empire, has been steadily carried on during the last six years, and the late elections show how successfully. The restoration of a Parliament to Ireland has been accepted in theory by the voters of the Empire. It remains to be seen how and when that restoration is likely to be carried out in practice.

The present time is indeed the most critical period of the century for Ireland's rights. An enormous gain has been made by the return to power of Mr. Gladstone, backed by a Home Rule majority of the House of Commons, but the establishment of an Irish Parliament on satisfactory lines is necessarily a slow and complicated work and the end of the struggle is not as yet. The opponents of Home Rule are a strong minority in the Commons, and they have full control of the House of Lords, which is, in theory, an equal branch of Parliament. Politics in Parliament, as well as elsewhere, are subject to sudden changes from unexpected causes, and English popular feeling, though usually slow in its action, is liable to occasional violent movements. The agitation caused by the nomination of the late Cardinal Wiseman to the Archbishopric of Westminster, and the anti-Irish outburst caused by the dynamite explosions in London, a few years ago, are examples of the liability to sudden panics which has been a feature of the English character since the earliest times. Questions may arise altogether outside of Home Rule, which would seriously divide Mr. Gladstone's followers, and it will need the most careful statesmanship in their leader to prevent the question of Home Rule from being overshadowed by others of less importance. The health of the aged statesman who has taken on himself so bravely the championship of Ireland's right is another cause for anxiety among Ireland's friends. Wonderful as is his vitality, it must not be forgotten that he carries the weight of eighty-four years on his shoulders, and the labor of conducting the government of such

an empire as the British is a herculean task even for the strongest constitution. Thoughts like these are well calculated to prevent any premature exultation in the minds of Ireland's friends at the present moment, and, at the same time, to impress on them the necessity of the highest prudence and unsparing diligence in the coming Parliamentary session. Negligence on the part of the Irish members or some burst of recklessness among unthinking and irresponsible Irishmen may postpone for years the hope of Irish self-government, which now seems so near.

Apart from the general question of securing Home Rule, it is of vital importance that the measure of it granted shall be adequate to the wants of the Irish people. We have every reason to believe Mr. Gladstone is sincere in the wish to secure to the Irish people complete control of their own country, subject only to an Imperial connection with the empire. Examples are not wanting within that empire to-day, of self-governing communities enjoying such a measure of practical independence as would fully satisfy the requirements of the Irish people. Such an autonomy as is possessed by Canada, by New Zealand, or by any of the provinces of Australia, would meet the needs and the national aspirations of Ireland, without imperilling the unity of the British empire. It is not to be supposed that the majority of Irishmen the world over, feel any enthusiasm for the British connection, but they are willing to accept it loyally, if their country's welfare be made compatible with its existence. Up to the present such has not been the case, and hence the great majority of the Irish race regards England with feelings of deep hostility. In the colonies just mentioned, however, that feeling has well nigh died out, under the influence of self-government, and there is no reason to doubt but such would also be the case in Ireland.

Neither Canada nor Australia, however, is the exact model on which Ireland's future Constitution is to be shaped in Mr. Gladstone's mind. There has been a good deal of talk during the past year over the measure of Home Rule that will be introduced into the present Parliament, and some of the Parnellites have demanded its full particulars from Gladstone, even while he was yet a simple member of Parliament. As a matter of fact, the main outlines of that measure have been before the public for the last five years.

The bill introduced in 1886, with certain changes in the matter of Irish contributions to imperial taxation, in the control of the police force, and probably in the Upper House of the Legislature, and coupled with the retention of the Irish members in the London Parliament, embodies substantially the form of Irish Parliament, which will be now proposed. In 1886 Mr. Gladstone



proposed to place the government of Ireland in all domestic affairs in the hands of an Irish Legislature. That body was to have no share in the administration of the empire at large, in the army or navy, in foreign relations of the empire, or in control of its colonies. It was to pay a fixed contribution to the imperial revenue, for general purposes, differing therein from Canada or Australia. The post-office, the mint and coinage, and the regulation of trade and navigation were also to be reserved to the Imperial Parliament, but on those points the author of the bill professed his readiness to accept changes if deemed desirable. The establishment of a state religion was also forbidden, and, finally, the constabulary force was to remain for a certain time subject to the English administration. The viceroy was to be continued, but not as now, as the representative of each dominant party in Great Britain, but simply as a representative of the sovereign appointed for a term of years, independently of English party changes.

The Irish ministry was to be responsible to the Irish Parliament in the same manner as the Imperial Ministry is to the British Parliament at present, and the functions of the Viceroy would be similar to those performed by the sovereign in the English government. The Lord-Lieutenant might veto the measures of the Irish Parliament, but his ministers would be practically unable to carry on the administration of an unpopular policy against the will of the Legislature. Finally the presence of the Irish members in the Parliament at Westminster was to cease, and the members themselves, with an equal number of elected colleagues, were to constitute the first Irish House of Commons. The twenty-eight peers who now represent the Irish Peerage in the English House of Lords were to be left to choose between seats in either house, and seventy-five additional members of the Upper Chamber were to be elected by a constituency more limited than the general body of voters.

The main points of the constitution thus proposed for Ireland will undoubtedly be retained in the next Home Rule Bill. Since 1886 Gladstone has modified his views by providing for the retention of the Irish representation in the British Parliament. The feeling in Ireland was strongly in favor of the original proposition. It was considered that the country would need the services of experienced legislators in its home legislature more urgently than in the London Parliament; and also that the retirement of Irish representatives from the latter body would increase the relative importance of the Dublin Parliament. There was much force in both arguments, but on the other hand the Irish representation in London is a most important element of security for the Parliament in Dublin. Were the Irish members withdrawn from the present British Parliament, the latter would become Unionist by a majority

of forty. It would have power at once to undo the work of Home Rule and further to cripple Irish influence in imperial affairs by restoring a single Imperial Parliament with an Irish membership diminished to a half or even less. These considerations induced Mr. Gladstone to announce that in his next Home Rule measure the present representation of Ireland will be retained at Westminster. He has also declared himself, though less definitely, in favor of giving the Irish Parliament complete control of the Irish police.

The retention of an Irish representation in the British Parliament and the removal of the Irish police force from the control of the latter body are the most radical changes that will be made in the new Home Rule Bill, as far as can be reasonably foreseen.

There are, however, many important modifications likely to be made in the measure of 1886, either by Mr. Gladstone himself when drafting his new bill, or during its discussion in the House. By the old bill the control of Irish trade and navigation laws, as well as of the Irish post-office, was reserved to the Imperial Parliament. Mr. Gladstone, however, declared that he was ready to modify these provisions if good reasons should be given for such a course at a later time. It would be most desirable that at least the regulation of Irish trade and navigation should be left to the management of the Irish Legislature as well as other Irish affairs. There does not appear any solid grounds for making them a distinct branch of the government, and the possible clashing of different administrations in essentially Irish business should be carefully avoided. The jealousy of English manufacturers and merchants, who apprehend that an Irish Parliament might take up a policy of protection, such as has been adopted by some of the Australian and North American colonies, has undoubtedly been the motive which led Mr. Gladstone to insert this clause in his bill. It is illogical and likely to lead to much subsequent friction between the two countries. The main reason given for the establishment of Home Rule by Mr. Gladstone himself is, that English rule has been disastrous to the interests of Ireland and exasperating to her people. It seems illogical to retain a part of such a system when it has been abandoned as a whole. What the Irish people demand and what their needs require, is full control of their own affairs. There is no good reason why Irish trade and Irish navigation should not be as important as Irish fisheries or Irish agriculture. It would certainly be better for the Irish people to have Home Rule in all other points than none at all, but it would be far more desirable to have it complete rather than marred by arbitrary exceptions. The discussion of these points, however, must be left to the discretion and patriotism of the Irish representatives who, it is to be hoped, will be able to secure the modifications required by their

country's wants, if they can be had without risking the failure of the Home Rule platform as a whole,

A matter of still greater importance is the amount to be paid by Ireland under the new system to the British treasury for strictly imperial purposes. These include the military and naval expenditures, the diplomatic service, the expenses of the crown and general government, and the payment of interest on the national debt. In his former bill Mr. Gladstone proposed that the Irish contribution for these objects should be one-fifteenth of that of the empire; or, in round numbers, seventeen million dollars annually. Though this amount is small in proportion to the relative population of Ireland and Great Britain, it is entirely out of proportion to the relative wealth of the two countries. The relative and even the actual wealth of Ireland has been steadily decreasing under the union. When that measure was passed, the wealth of Ireland was estimated to be two-seventeenths of the whole empire, and its contributions were to be assessed on that basis. Mr. Giffen, the well-known English statistician, in a recent work estimates the present wealth of Ireland at only one-twenty-third part of that of Great Britain. In 1812 the actual value of all property in Ireland was estimated by Mr. Colquhoun, an officer of the Board of Trade, at five hundred and sixty-three millions of pounds. This year Mr. Giffen only puts it at a little over four hundred millions, while he gives the resources of England at eight thousand six hundred millions, or about forty-three thousand million dollars. The average wealth of Englishmen is over twenty times that of the inhabitants of Ireland, including both Dublin and Belfast. At the same time Ireland now pays taxes to the amount of seven million pounds to the treasury, apart from local taxation, or a full twelfth of the whole expenditures of the empire. A system of taxation which extorts double payments from the poorest country in a supposed equal union has contributed enormously to the general decay which has settled on Irish prosperity, apart from the other evils of foreign government. Since the Crimean War the taxes levied from Ireland have been increased over fifty per cent., while the comparative increase in England has been, we believe, little over twelve. It must be remembered that during this period of thirty-six years the actual wealth of Ireland has been steadily diminishing while that of Great Britain has been as steadily growing. Before the famine Ireland was certainly taxed to her full capacity, and the annual amount imposed on her was only about twenty-one million dollars. Since that period her population has shrunk from eight millions and a half to less than five millions, half her cultivated land has been abandoned, and no new source of wealth has been added to her resources, but the taxation extorted from



her by the British government has risen to thirty-five million dollars. We are within bounds in saying that the extra taxation taken from Ireland since the Crimean War equals four hundred million dollars, or nearly double the amount which the late government proposed to advance as a loan for the purpose of buying out the interests of a part of the Irish landlords. This excessive taxation during the last forty years has been, we are convinced, one of the chief causes of Ireland's industrial decay. Its diminution is a matter of necessity. With intelligent self-government the country might be able to bear its present taxation and recover something of the prosperity of the other countries of Western Europe, but it is at least doubtful. It would be within the power of Mr. Gladstone to materially reduce the contribution of Home Rule Ireland to the imperial treasury, and if the case be fairly stated to him by the Irish representatives he probably will do so. The point is a most important one, and it is to be trusted it will not be overlooked in the coming session of Parliament.

A measure of land purchase by which a hundred and eighty million pounds of government debentures secured by the lands purchased and by the national credit were to be issued for the purpose of buying the land of Ireland from its present landlords and transferring it to the tenant-farmers as purchasers from the government at a low rate of interest, accompanied Mr. Gladstone's last Home Rule Bill. This proposal will certainly not be renewed. About a quarter of the amount suggested has been already issued by Lord Salisbury's Government with little practical result except to enable some large proprietors to exchange Irish rents for Government securities. No appreciable result in the general well-being of the country has followed. It is likely that Mr. Gladstone will leave the future settlement of the relations between landlord and tenant to the wisdom of the Irish Parliament. The land question is a most important one, but it is essentially subordinate to that of self-government for the country, and need not be further discussed at this moment.

The kind of self-government which Mr. Gladstone proposes to secure to Ireland has been made sufficiently clear. It remains to consider whether it is sufficient for the needs of Ireland and the national aspirations of Irishmen. If fairly carried into effect we believe it will be found so. It would make Irish interests the interests of Government in Ireland. It would put the laws and their administration in harmony with the sober judgment of the nation in place of being, as they now too often are, in direct opposition both to the popular conscience and the true interests of the country. It would put the legislation and development of public education and of all public works, under control of the Irish peo-

ple, and would give a fair chance of arresting the ruin of all interests in Ireland which has now continued uninterruptedly for forty-five years. It would meet the national sentiment by the restoration of an Irish self-governed nationality which could well afford to dispense with direct relations with other countries if left undisturbed in the management of its own. The fact that Gladstone's original Bill of 1886 was accepted by the entire body of the Irish National Representatives, including their then leader, Mr. Parnell, as a fair substitute for Grattan's Parliament, is the strongest practical evidence that the Home Rule which it proposed is a genuine restoration of Irish National government. The retention of the Irish Representatives in Westminster, was on deliberation, fully approved of by the same parties. Since the late election Messrs. McCarthy, Dillon and Sexton, the leaders of the present Nationalist party, have been in consultation with Mr. Gladstone on the subject of the various modifications in detail to be made in the coming measure, and have expressed themselves fully satisfied that they will be of a nature to enlarge rather than to restrict the control to be given to the Irish people over their own affairs. As far as ordinary human foresight goes the system which Mr. Gladstone will propose will prove as adequate to the requirements of the Irish people as the Repeal demanded by O'Connell and Davis or any other measure short of complete independence that has as yet been proposed for Ireland's government.

It need not be concealed that the difficulties yet to be surmounted before Home Rule can become an actual fact are many.

Gladstone by six years' work has now secured a clear majority in its favor, but the opposition to it is still very strong. In England itself the Tories and the Chamberlain Unionists, who are simply Liberals opposed to the Irish claims, have returned two hundred and sixty-seven members, while the party in favor of justice to Ireland has only one hundred and ninety-eight. It is Wales and Scotland, not England, that have built up Mr. Gladstone's majority, with, of course, the Irish members included. There are many possible accidents that might for a time give the anti-Irish feeling full sway again in England. Such an event as the murder of the late Lord Frederick Cavendish, or the Clerkenwell dynamite explosion, would be quite likely to produce such a result. Even leaving such chances aside, the mere course of Parliamentary proceedings may cause schisms among Mr. Gladstone's supporters; that might overthrow his administration. A British Ministry is unlike an administration in this country, which holds office for a definite number of years. While a term of six years is presented as the limit of a Parliament's duration which cannot be passed, its practical length is determined by the popularity of the ministry in

power. If the latter from any cause, should fail to command a majority in the Commons on some vital measure, it has either to retire or call a new election. A blunder on the part of a minister, is quite capable of wrecking a government under the British system. In Gladstone's present party, while all his supporters are in favor of Home Rule, there are wide divergencies of opinion on other points. A section of the advanced Liberals desire the abolition of the House of Lords and the Established Church, while the majority are unwilling to attempt such radical measures now. The labor question and an eight hour law, are also points on which serious differences exist in the English Liberal party. It is quite possible for Mr. Gladstone to keep his followers together in spite of those differences, but in the course of a session many occasions occur in which private feelings may get the better of party allegiance. Much will depend on the spirit in which the session begins. If Mr. Gladstone can favorably impress his followers by displays of marked ability in the introductory work of Parliament, the popularity of his government will carry away all local grumblers, and insure the support of the country outside.

Should Mr. Gladstone, however, be unable to take a strong attitude, or his subordinates commit any official blunders of importance, the strength of the government might be so reduced that it would be unable to effect its purpose or be forced to appeal to the country. A Parliamentary session is virtually a campaign in which it is not enough for the leader to have superior strength on his side if he does not also use it to the best advantage in every part of the field. The position of the Irish members calls for the highest tact at the present moment as well as the steadiest fidelity to their work. Home Rule is, of course, the great object for which they are in the English Parliament at all, but they must use their position with the utmost prudence in the choice of means to attain it. The greater the strength that Mr. Gladstone can command in Parliament the greater the chances of winning Irish self-government. There will be numerous subjects to occupy attention besides Home Rule during a session, and on those, common sense as well as national gratitude requires that the Irish Nationalists should give every effort to strengthen the hands of the Home Rule Ministry. Some other measures may be brought forward such as the payment of members, the restriction of voting power to one vote for each elector, or other general legislation deemed necessary to strengthen the power of Mr. Gladstone's party. On such, if he should call for the aid of the Irish members it should be given loyally and fully. The Irish members have no need to merge their existence in that of the English Liberals to do this much. Such a policy would be a direct denial of the necessity of Home Rule itself,



but as practical men it is their duty to help by every legitimate means of Parliamentary warfare in maintaining Mr. Gladstone in power, while he upholds the principle of Home Rule. They must avoid frittering away his strength by side issues or personal ambitions and must loyally accept his leadership in the details of the campaign as soldiers obey the commands of a general without demanding an explanation of each movement which he commands. In Parliamentary struggles as in actual warfare, strict discipline, however irksome its restraints, is the first requisite for success. Such a discipline is the most effective aid which the Irish National members can give their country now in the crisis of her struggle for self-government.

It must be confessed that the greatest danger which the cause of Home Rule has lately encountered has arisen from the ranks of the Irish Nationalists themselves. The division which occurred in the Irish Nationalist members when Parnell set his own name against the decision of the majority has been continued after his death by his followers. At a moment when the fate of Ireland as a nation hangs in the balance as never before in the century, a certain number of politicians, professing themselves to be Irish Nationalists, have attempted to divide the forces of the country on purely personal grounds. In all the utterances of the Parnellite party, we have failed to find a single general principle on which division in the Nationalist ranks could be justified. Their leaders had all been elected to Parliament as advocates of Home Rule and had pledged themselves to sit, vote and act with the majority of their party for that end. They had accepted Gladstone's Home Rule Bill of 1886, as a reasonable satisfaction of Ireland's claims and during four years they had supported him strenuously in Parliament and out of it as the man to whose success meant the deliverance of their country, and had commended him as such to the Irish people.

On the occasion of the O'Shea divorce scandal, however, Gladstone as a politician felt obliged to warn his Irish allies that Mr. Parnell's continuance as leader would make it impossible for himself to obtain a majority in favor of Home Rule. This declaration it was his duty as a public leader to make, and the majority of the Irish members in their undoubted right of judgment saw fit to remove Mr. Parnell from the leadership to prevent disaster to the cause of their country. The minority has since broken the hitherto undivided party of Irish Nationalists into two sections on the question of whether the treatment awarded to Parnell was expedient or otherwise. No other point of difference could be discovered between the professed principles of the two sections. Both professed their object to be the attainment of Home Rule on

the general lines of Mr. Gladstone's first bill ; but the minority claimed that it was an equally important matter to take revenge on the opponents of Parnell for his deposition. On this point alone, they divided the Nationalist party of Ireland into two camps in over fifty constituencies at the last election. Five or six seats representing ten or twelve in divisions, were thus handed over to the Tory foes of Irish self-government, and it is alleged with apparent truth, that from ten to twenty other seats were lost in Great Britain, by the forced absence of Irish Home Rule speakers, who were engaged in defending their own seats in purely Nationalist constituencies, while they should have been winning Unionist seats in Great Britain. The final outcome has been that the Parnellites are reduced to insignificance in the house. They have got nine unpledged members out of eighty Irish Home Rulers. Of the Nationalist seats in the late Parliament, two in Dublin and three in Ulster have been captured by the opponents of Home Rule. The actual majority in favor of Home Rule is forty, while it would have been from sixty to ninety, had the Parnellites been willing to accept the principle that in a party organized for a common national object, the will of the majority should be the supreme law. This result has at least one good effect. It has opened the eyes of Irishmen the world over to the dangers of allowing personal feelings or personal allegiance to any man to usurp the place of political principle in the struggle for the common welfare of the Irish nation.

The action of the nine Parnellite members in the coming session may be the most serious danger that Home Rule will have to contend with. It is not too late for them yet to redeem themselves by joining heartily in the Parliamentary struggle for Irish self-government, but if they allow their ill-will towards Mr. Gladstone and the desire, which some of them have expressed, to punish him for his attitude towards Parnell, to sway their votes they may impede very considerably the establishment of Home Rule. Fortunately, their numbers are not sufficient to change his majority into a minority, and the pressure of public opinion in Ireland, as well as, it may be hoped, the national sympathies, which cannot be dead in their own breasts, will probably keep them from going over to the ranks of their country's foes.

As to the nature of the contest to be expected over the Home Rule measure, when introduced into Parliament, its early stages will not differ materially from those of any other important legislative measure. Mr. Gladstone's proposals will be resisted, as a whole, by the Tory and Chamberlain parties with all their strength and strenuous efforts will also be made to modify its details so as to concede as little as possible to the wishes of the Irish people.

If during the debates on Home Rule any occasion should offer for exciting the prejudices of the English people or of any section of Mr. Gladstone's Parliamentary supporters, it will be taken advantage of as fully as the ability of its opponents will permit. Some foreign complication or internal question may temporarily embarrass the Government, and if such should arise it will be at once used as a weapon to prevent the granting of Home Rule. It is on such occasions that the chief danger is to be apprehended from the Irish Parnellites. They may bring forward questions of minor importance on which English prejudice may be excited should Mr. Gladstone concede, or Irish popular feeling if he should reject them. The question of pardoning the men confined in English prisons for real or alleged participation in dynamite outrages is one of this kind which has already been exploited by some of the Parnellite politicians. Now that they are out of power, the Tories would be perfectly willing to vote for the amnesty which they refused persistently while in office, if by so doing they could overthrow the Home Rule Ministry and so secure the maintenance of the Union. The course for all real friends of Ireland is plain. Home Rule is the question of the hour, and to it all others must temporarily be subordinated. Gladstone is the recognized leader of the Home Rule Ministry, and he should receive loyal support from all friends of Ireland in the contest which approaches. In the details of that contest common sense as well as gratitude suggests that his judgment should be respected and his policy supported on all occasions in which dissent is not absolutely necessary. It is quite within reckoning that in many details his line of action may not be that which his Irish supporters would choose, but he must be given the right of a general to regulate his campaign, so long as his fidelity to the Irish cause is sure. That the veteran statesman is really determined to secure Home Rule for Ireland his retirement from office in 1886, rather than abandon it, is the best guarantee that can be given. Magnanimity is a rare quality among the political leaders of any country, and among none more than British statesmen. Gladstone alone, that we can remember, of English ministers, has more than once placed the claims of justice above party interests or national prejudices. He may not have done so always, but he certainly has given striking examples of such conduct twice, before the introduction of the Home Rule Bill. He brought about the cession of the Ionian Islands to Greece a quarter of a century ago, as an act of national justice, and he acknowledged the independence of the Transvaal, in 1879, in defiance of British Jingoism. That he should undo the brutal work of Pitt and restore national government to Ireland at the close of his career,



would be a work to render his name immortal in the love of the Irish people. The future is in the hands of God and man should not presume to foresee it with prophetic vision, unless the prophet's inspiration be accorded from on high. It may safely be said, however, that William Ewart Gladstone has brought the realization of Ireland's dearest hope nearer than it has ever been before. Never, since Sarsfield opened the gates of Limerick to the Dutch invader, and led the last Irish national army away to exile, two hundred years ago, has the Irish people seen a genuine Irish Government within its reach. The Parliament of Grattan and the Volunteers was at best but the government of a small section of the English colonists, naturalized indeed into Irishmen, but who regarded the mass of the Irish nation as the Spaniards of Mexico regarded the Indians, or the West India planters their negro slaves. The Repeal movement, which for two years massed the great body of the Irish Catholic population in a united demand for self-government, made no serious impression on the Parliament or people of England. The determination to maintain the Union at whatever cost was as fixed a dogma of the British political creed for thirty years after O'Connell's death as was the exclusion of Catholics from all share in the British Government during the last century. The change which has since come to pass is extraordinary indeed. This year a majority of the House of Commons, in the hands of which rests, absolutely, the supreme power of the British Empire, has declared itself ready to establish a National Government in Ireland. It is hard to realize how great is the revolution which thus gives the prize for which Sarsfield fought and Lord Edward and Wolfe Tone and Emmett died, for which O'Connell moved the Irish masses as one man in vain, and Davis and Dillon and Mitchell and Duffy poured out their souls. The dream of ages has well nigh come, and Ireland promises in the near future to be "a nation once again."

It is not surprising that Irishmen who for so many generations have grown to regard their struggle for freedom as a duty rather than a hope, should scarcely realize that victory has come within their grasp at last. They have held to their nationality as they held to their religious faith under the penal code, as a question of justice not of expediency—and they can hardly feel as yet that the national thralldom they have borne for centuries is passing away like the intolerance which so long bound their faith. It is all important, however, that they should realize that such is the case, and act accordingly. The present moment is no time for dreaming. It is the very crisis of the fate of Ireland. It calls on the whole Irish race for supreme effort of sacrifice and discipline to achieve the restoration of nationhood. It is not enough for Irishmen,

more than for any other people, to wish to be free. They must actively employ the means necessary to win freedom, and those means now are fully within their own power: Union in the common cause, strict discipline under the chosen leaders of the people, and the sinking of all personal ends or petty dissensions among the people themselves, are the great requisites to make Home Rule a reality. All these rest with Irishmen themselves, and in spite of recent divisions in their ranks, we hope and believe they will not be wanting. That the Parnellite partisans will let their personal feelings prevail over their patriotism, we cannot think. Their cordial reunion with the majority of their countrymen would make the events of the last eighteen months be quickly forgotten. Their opposition might delay Home Rule, but could not prevent it, and between these alternatives it is unreasonable to doubt what their action will be when the next session opens.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

---

## OUR PAROCHIAL SCHOOL SYSTEM—THE PROGRESS IT HAS MADE AND IS MAKING.

SOME time ago certain sweeping assertions were made in an educational review and a number of other periodicals respecting the Catholic parochial school movement. These assertions led up to the false conclusion that our parochial schools are a practical failure so far as their ultimate purpose—the providing of sufficient school facilities for the Catholic children of our country—was concerned. Various figures were given which were entirely fallacious, in that they hugely exaggerated the number of Catholic children in the United States who can reasonably be expected to attend school, and greatly underestimated the proportion of those children that do attend school.

One of these statements went so far as to assert that there are about two and a half millions of Catholic children of "school age" in our country, while there are but seven hundred thousand pupils in the Catholic parochial schools.

The inference from this fallacious statement was that less than one-third of the Catholic children in our country attended Catholic schools, and that the remaining two-thirds, or more, either attended the public schools or did not go to school at all.

It is not our intention, nor is it necessary, to examine these

erroneous statements in detail. We first confine ourself to proving the absurdity of the assertion that in the United States there are two and a half millions of Catholic children of "school age." We heartily wish the assertion were true; but true it is not, and the untruth will quickly be seen by every one who has any knowledge of the proportion of children to population. Not to speak of children of "school age," but confining attention simply to children of any age, you cannot, by any fair process of computation, make out that two and a half millions of the nine millions or (if you please) ten millions of practical Catholics in our country are children who are or ought to be at school.

A few figures gleaned from reports of the United States census and from the report of the United States Commissioner of Education conclusively prove the truth of what we have just said. Two millions and a half are almost exactly twenty-seven and eight-tenths per cent. of nine millions, and all the "children" in the United States of from six to seventeen years (both included) are about twenty-seven and eight-tenths per cent. of the entire population of our country. Consequently, to make up two and a half millions of Catholic children of "school age," you must include every Catholic boy and girl from six to seventeen years of age. If you compute the Catholic population of the United States at ten millions, two millions and a half "children" would be about twenty-five per cent. of the Catholic population of our country, and would include every Catholic boy and girl (without even a single exception) from seven to sixteen as children who ought to be at school.

This is a perfect *reductio ad absurdum*. It involves a demand that Catholic parochial schools do more than our "magnificent" "American" public school system has ever done, and, we hesitate not to say, ever will be able to do. We have before us the report of the United States Commissioner of Education for 1888-89, the latest that up to this time has been published. According to this report, the total number of children enrolled in all the public schools (primary, grammar and high) from seven years of age to eighteen is just twenty per cent. of the whole population of the United States.

Again, according to these tables, the number of children in the United States between seven and seventeen years of age is almost one-third (more than thirty-two per cent.) of the whole population; but when we inquire for the proportionate number of these children who are in *actual attendance* upon public schools (primary, grammar and high), we learn that they are less than thirteen per cent. (twelve and eight-tenths) of the population. From this it appears that the number of children attending the public schools in proportion to the whole population of our country is less than



is the number of children attending Catholic parochial schools in proportion to the whole Catholic population.

There are other very significant facts that we may learn from the statistics of the United States Commissioner of Education.

Of 7,572,000 pupils in actual attendance upon public schools in the United States (primary, grammar and high), there are only 135,000 in the high schools and 2,062,000 in the grammar schools, leaving 5,375,000 in the *primary* schools. In the face of these facts how little truth is there in the assertion that the public schools are the *people's* schools!

Again, it appears, from these statistics, that of the 7,572,000 pupils in the public schools of the United States 7,000,000 were under thirteen years of age, 275,000 were thirteen, 162,000 were fourteen, leaving only 135,000 pupils in all the public schools in the United States who were over fourteen years of age. In other words, of all the children in the public schools in the United States ninety-two and one-half per cent. are not over thirteen years of age, and ninety-six per cent. are not over fourteen.<sup>1</sup>

We have gone into these tedious details not so much for the purpose of dispelling delusive notions that are entertained of the public schools and the work they are doing, as of furnishing a basis of comparison between them and the Catholic parochial schools.

There is still another very significant fact which these tables show. It is this: According to the proportion of persons of different ages to population, as shown by United States census statistics, there were in the year 1889 (the year of which we have given educational statistics taken from the report of the United States Commissioner) eighteen millions of persons in our country of from seven to eighteen years of age. Of these 7,572,000 were in attendance on public schools, primary, grammar and high, or almost exactly forty-two per cent.; or, if you add 800,000 or 850,000 Catholics who are attending Catholic parochial schools and other schools of like character (as we will show), you will have, in the

---

<sup>1</sup> There seems to be a perfect craze to extend the period of so-called "school age" to its utmost possible limits. The United States Census Superintendent says that in "the published reports of previous censuses statements concerning persons of school age have been limited to 5 to 17 years, both inclusive," but under the present census "results are given covering persons from 5 to 20 years, both years inclusive."

From the same bulletin (dated August 13, 1892) we learn that in twenty-five States of the Union the "school age" includes persons of 21 years of age, and in nine other States it includes persons of 20 years. On the other hand, in five States of the Union "school age" begins at four years; in eighteen States it begins at five years, and in twenty States it begins at six years.

Where is the sense of thus stretching "school age" to impracticable limits, when, of the whole number of children in our public schools, 96 per cent. are between the ages of 7 and 14, and 92½ per cent. are between the ages of 7 and 13?

one case, forty-six per cent. ; in the other you will have forty-nine per cent. of the eighteen millions of persons in our country who, in 1889, were of from seven to eighteen years of age. It will surprise not a few of the friends and supporters of Catholic schools, not to speak of their enemies, when we say that our Catholic schools make a much better showing. Yet statistics fully confirm this statement, as we hope to be able clearly to show before we have finished.

We now take up the question of the number of *Catholic* children in our country who are of what is the *practical* school age in the United States, according to the statistics we have cited. We have seen, from the statistics of the United States Commissioner of Education, that the vast majority (ninety-six per cent.) of the pupils in all the public schools in the United States are between the ages of seven and fourteen years. The number of children included in that period is exactly, or almost exactly, one-sixth of the whole population of our country.

Apply these figures to Catholic parochial schools. There are upwards of seven hundred thousand children in these schools, and almost all of them are between the ages of seven and fourteen. The Catholic population of our country (that is, the number of practical Catholics) is variously estimated at from nine millions to ten millions. One-sixth of nine millions is one and one-half millions. One-sixth of ten millions is one and two-thirds millions. We care not which estimate is adopted. According to the first there are 1,500,000 Catholic children of practical school age in the United States ; according to the second there are 1,667,000.

But there is another fact that must be borne in mind. It is that the period mentioned, from seven years of age to fourteen, is longer, by at least two years, than the average number of years that pupils attend either the public schools or Catholic parochial schools. The average period both in the public schools and in Catholic parochial schools does not exceed five years. It is not necessary to occupy space in proving this. The State and National educational reports testify to the truth of what we have said as regards the public schools, and statistics of the parochial schools prove it as regards these last-mentioned schools.

This fact, if duly considered, shows that a further reduction of at least one-fifth must be made from the figures given to show the real number of Catholic children that do attend or that can reasonably be expected to attend school, whether parochial or public. We deduct one-fifth, and the 1,500,000 children, according to one estimate, and the 1,667,000, according to the other estimate, are reduced, respectively, to 1,200,000 in the one case and to 1,334,000 in the other.

Now for the assertion that the parochial school system has failed in the purpose for which it was instituted. What have Catholics in our country actually done in the way of providing for the education of their children in Catholic parochial schools? According to the last Catholic Directory the number of children in Catholic parochial schools in the year 1891, so far as could be ascertained, was 700,753. To this must be added, at the very least, 50,000 children attending Catholic parochial schools from which no reports were received. There are upwards of 25,000 children in Catholic orphan asylums to which schools are attached (the exact number reported is 24,572, and fourteen dioceses are not reported). Moreover, there are other Catholic eleemosynary institutions in which Catholic children are educated. Taking these facts into consideration, we feel fully justified in saying that the number of Catholic children in parochial or other like schools of from seven to fourteen years of age is at least 800,000, and probably 850,000. We have, then, eight hundred thousand Catholic children of the ages mentioned, who are educated in Catholic schools, over against a total of 1,200,000, or of 1,334,000 Catholic children (whichever estimate you adopt), or, according to the first estimate, sixty-six and two-thirds per cent.; according to the second estimate, sixty per cent.

The inference is, and it is borne out by the statistics we have given, that the Catholics of our country, notwithstanding the double burden they must bear, are doing more to give *their* children a Catholic education, than are the people of the United States, as a whole, to educate children in the public schools, though the latter are supported by public taxation; and, in a number of States and cities, are backed by compulsory education laws. Surely there is nothing in these facts to discourage Catholics or to justify the *pessimistic* assertion that the Catholic parochial school system is a practical failure.

There is another very important and very encouraging fact which an examination of Catholic statistics clearly shows. It is that the proportionate increase in the number of Catholic children of the ages mentioned, in attendance upon Catholic parochial schools, is more than double that of the increase of Catholic population in the same period.

Here are the figures: In 1882 the number of children attending Catholic parochial schools was 428,642; in 1891 the number was 700,753, an increase during nine years of sixty-four per cent. The number of Catholics in 1882, as given in the Catholic Directory was 6,832,954; the number in 1891 was 8,647,221, an increase of twenty-six and one-half per cent. Now apply these proportions to Catholic schools on the one hand and to Catholic population on the other, and see what the result will be, nine years hence.



Taking 1,200,000 as the number of Catholic children of the ages mentioned and adding twenty-six and a-half per cent, we will have 1,518,000, and taking 800,000 as the number of children in Catholic parochial schools, orphan asylums, etc., and adding sixty-four per cent., we will have, nine years hence, 1,312,000 children receiving a Catholic education, or nearly all the Catholic children, of practical school age, in the United States. If you take the other estimate—that the number of Catholic children of practical school age in the United States is 1,334,000—as your basis of computation, you will arrive at substantially the same conclusion.

Nine years, or twice nine years, is a very short period in the history of the Church and of our country. To realize the blessed results above shown to be not only possible, but certainly attainable, it only requires that the Catholics of the United States, Bishops, Priests, and laity continue their present exertions, their present self-sacrifices, their present zeal for Catholic education. Far from being discouraged, we Catholics have every reason for being encouraged. There is every reason not only for not relaxing effort and zeal for Catholic education, but for renewing and redoubling them. Most fruitful of blessed results, have been, and are, the Catholic parochial schools of the United States. Love for the Church, love for the welfare of our country, demand that they be generously supported, increased in number, and in efficiency.

And now we dismiss the question of the ability of the Catholic parochial school system to sufficiently provide for the education of all the Catholic children in our country, who may reasonably be expected to attend them. We propose, in conclusion, to say a few words to our pessimist friends, who have persuaded themselves, and tried to persuade the public, that after forty years of earnest efforts the Catholics of the United States have been barely able to establish parochial schools sufficient to educate less than one-third of the Catholic children of practical school age in the United States. The assertion is utterly false. In the first place the period in which the Catholics of the United States have been so circumstanced that they could devote much of their attention, efforts, and money to the parochial school system is not forty years. It is less than twenty years. The fact is so well known that we need not stop to explain. In the second place, the progress made in this blessed work during the last ten years has been at least two-fold greater than in any other previous period. We hazard nothing in predicting that the progress in the next ten years will be much greater than during the last ten years. So far as we can see, so far as we believe, there is no abatement of effort or of zeal on the part, generally, of our Bishops, Priests or laity. On

the contrary there is a manifest increase. It calls for no prophet to predict that in the next nine or ten years practically all the Catholic children in our country will be in attendance on Catholic schools.

With one other remark we conclude. Conceding for the sake of argument, what we refuse to concede as a matter of fact—for it is not a fact, that the Catholic parochial schools are now, and ever will be, incapable of educating more than 700,000 or 800,000 children of Catholics in the United States,—that would be no reason for withdrawing support from the Catholic parochial schools. Every rector of a Catholic Church, who has a parochial school in his parish knows, and every curate in such a parish knows, that the children who are educated in the parochial schools, are far better prepared for first communion, and for confirmation, than he or they can prepare, with utmost pains and effort, the Catholic children who attend public schools. Every such rector and every such curate knows full well that the children educated in the parochial schools are the *hope* of the parish; that it is *they* and not the children educated in public schools, who will be the most exemplary practical, devout members of the Church; that it is from *them* and not from the Catholic children educated in the public schools, that the sodalities and confraternities of the parish are chiefly recruited and receive their most exemplary members. We might enlarge but we forbear. The work of Catholic parochial school education is a thrice blessed work. It has been blessed by Sovereign Pontiffs of the Church, blessed by the Fathers of the Plenary Councils of Baltimore, blessed by its evident results.

GEORGE D. WOLFF.

---

## Scientific Chronicle.

---

### LIGHT-HOUSE CONSTRUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES.

WE had begun to think that the readers of this REVIEW would be getting about tired of "Light-Houses," and were on the point of striking out for pastures new, when it was pointed out to us that we had left a good part of the subject untouched, and we were requested to make good the deficiency. We were indeed already well aware that the matter was by no means exhausted; it would require volumes for that. Now, gentle reader, possess your soul in peace. We are not going to write volumes, but only this one short article, promising that, sink or swim, survive or perish, it shall be the last on this topic. In this article all we propose is to say a few words about the construction of some typical American Light-Houses.

#### THE OLD MINOT'S LEDGE LIGHT-HOUSE.

The terrible storm which visited our coasts in the the Spring of 1851 is not yet forgotten by those who witnessed it; but among the calamities of that dread April, none have left a more lasting impression on the minds of men than the destruction of Minot's Ledge Light-House. It was of the iron-skeleton type, planned and erected by Captain W. H. Swift, of the U. S. Engineer Corps. A few selections from his official report, dated November, 1848, will give a good idea of the work:

"Minot's Rocks—or as they are generally called 'The Minots,'—lie off the southeastern chop of Boston Bay. These rocks or ledges, with others in their immediate vicinity, are also known as the 'Cohasset Rocks,' and have been the terror of mariners for a long period of years; they have been, probably, the cause of a greater number of wrecks than any other ledges or reefs on the coast, lying as they do at the very entrance to the second city of the United States in point of tonnage, and consequently where vessels are constantly passing and repassing. The Minots are bare only at three-quarters ebb, and vessels bound in, with the wind heavy at the northeast, are liable, if they fall to the leeward of Boston light, to be driven upon these reefs. The rock selected for the site of the light-house is called the 'Outer Minot,' and is the most seaward of the group." The nearest shore is Cohasset, one and a half miles south, while Boston Light (Little Brewster) is about eight miles to the northwest, and from the latter, the town of Boston itself lies eight miles due west. At extreme low water an area of about 30 feet in diameter is exposed, and the highest point in the rock is about  $3\frac{1}{2}$  feet above the line of low water. It is very rarely, however, that a surface greater than 25 feet in diameter is left bare by the sea.

"The rock is granite, with vertical seams of trap rising through it.



The form of the light-house is an octagon, 25 feet in diameter at the base. The structure is supported on nine heavy wrought-iron piles, one at each corner of the octagon, and one at the centre; holes 12 inches in diameter, and 5 feet deep were drilled in the rock to receive these piles; the outer holes at such an inclination that, at an elevation of 60 feet above the base of the middle pile, the pile-heads would be brought within the periphery of a circle 14 feet in diameter. The centre pile was 8 inches in diameter at the bottom, and 6 inches at top; the other piles have the same diameter, 8 inches at the bottom, and  $4\frac{1}{2}$  inches at the top; at their upper ends they are securely keyed and bolted to the arms of a heavy casting or cap. It is understood that the foundation piles do not extend the whole 60 feet; but that there are in all three series of piles joined to each other by very stout cast-iron sockets and strongly braced."

These series, or sections, were of nearly equal height, and at their junctions, sets of strong horizontal braces were securely fastened to the piles, thus constituting two skeleton floors, one at a height of 20, the other at a height of about 40 feet above the foundation. Later on, vertical tie-rods were introduced between these floors, in order to assist in rendering the structure proof against undue vibrations. On top of this foundation was placed the lantern, bringing the height of the whole up to 70 feet. Moreover, immediately under the lantern, a store-room about 12 feet deep was constructed, access to which could be had through the floor or the lantern.

In the construction of this light-house, the principal difficulty encountered was the drilling of those nine holes, 5 feet deep and 1 foot in diameter, in the solid granite. We hardly understand now why a 12-inch hole was considered necessary to receive an 8-inch pier, unless perchance it was for the sake of greater ease in planting such heavy masses of iron in place, or perhaps to leave room for wedges to hold the piers to the rock; no cement seems to have been used in the work. The first blow was struck on the rock in the Spring of 1847 and the whole work completed, and the light exhibited in November, 1848. The cost was something less than \$40,000. Two keepers were installed, and all went on pleasantly till April, 1851. The report of Captain Swift reads as follows:

"On Monday night, April 14th, the wind which had been easterly for several days, gradually increased. On Tuesday it had become a severe gale from the northeast. It continued to blow with the utmost violence through Tuesday night, Wednesday, Thursday, and even Friday; but the height of the storm was on Wednesday, the 16th, and at that time it was a perfect hurricane. The light on the Minot was last seen from Cohasset, on Wednesday night at 10 o'clock; at 1 o'clock, Thursday morning the 17th, the light-house bell was heard on shore, one-and-one-half miles distant; and this being the hour of high water, or rather the turn of the tide, when from the opposition of the wind and the tide it is supposed that the sea was at its very highest mark; and it was at that hour, it is generally believed, that the light-house was

destroyed; at day-break nothing of it was visible from the shore, and hence it is most probable it was overthrown at or about the hour named."

When the storm had sufficiently abated, the site was visited (April 22d), and a part of the wrecked structure was found more than 100 feet away. The piers held firm to their moorings in the rock, but were broken or twisted off, leaving stumps from four to six feet in length. The bodies of the unfortunate keepers were never recovered.

Various causes have been assigned by different writers for the unexpected destruction of Minot's Ledge Light-House. We will sum them up in as few words as possible.

In the first place the keeper did a foolish thing. To the second set of horizontal braces he fastened a sort of deck or platform on which he stowed such heavy articles as fuel, barrels of water, etc. These should have been in the store-room above. It is evident that, if the waves should reach this platform, the large surface it offered to their shock would be a source of great danger. On Wednesday afternoon, at 4 o'clock, that platform came ashore at Cohasset. How much the light-house was strained and weakened by the blows of the waves against the 175 square feet of platform, before it parted, no one can conjecture. Nor was this the only piece of folly on the part of the keeper. He had also attached a five-and-a-half inch hawser to the lantern deck, and anchored the other end to a granite block weighing seven tons, placed at a distance of some 300 feet from the base of the tower. Its purpose was to provide a means of running a landing chair or box up and down. This was very handy no doubt, and the keeper was a handy man, but he belonged to that class of men who know just enough not to know how much they don't know. To be of any use, that long cable had to be made fairly taut, and when the waves swept by, it must have exerted a tremendous pull on the end of that 60-foot lever. If, besides, what is quite possible, the separate pulls happened to be timed to the vibration-period of the tower, then, sooner or later, something would have to give. The effect was, as Captain Swift observes, just as if a number of men were pulling at a rope attached to the highest part of the structure, with the *design* of pulling it down.

Again, the storm itself was something unparalleled in the history of our Atlantic coast. A heavy wind blowing continuously, and with ever increasing violence for several days, from the east, would necessarily pile the waters up far above their usual level, and at the same time very greatly increase the violence of the waves. That such really did take place is evidenced by the fact that the platform, mentioned above, was, as we have seen, torn from its fastenings, although its position on the tower was 36 feet above ordinary high water, and 28 feet above the highest spring tides. A few feet more would bring the waves in contact with the main body of the structure; and if this really did take place, it is clear that such a sea acting upon the surface of the building, at the end of a lever-arm more than 60 feet long, would be well nigh irresistible. We know too that the lower portions of cities along the

coast were flooded, and we recollect specially seeing boats paddled around in the streets of Salem, Mass., for a couple of days. A further evidence of the exceptional violence of that storm was that vessels were wrecked in the very harbor of Boston, among others, the "Royal George," of Liverpool. Such, under the circumstances, seem to be the principal causes of the fall of Minot's Ledge Light-House.

When this much has been said, one thing remains certain, viz., that the real defect of Minot's Ledge Light-House was its want of magnitude. If Congress had appropriated \$150,000 instead of \$40,000, an iron skeleton could have been built having a base of 40 feet and a height of 100 feet, and it is safe to say that the waves would never have reached the enclosed portion of the structure, and that it would have laughed at the storm of 1851, and be standing to-day as solid and sound as ever. Nothing defeats its own ends so surely, in the long run, as littleness and narrowness when there is question of a great undertaking.

#### THE NEW MINOT'S LEDGE LIGHT-HOUSE.

The necessity of a light at this point, in the interest both of commerce and of humanity, was so evident that Congress immediately voted an appropriation for the purpose. But before anything could be done, the Light-House Board, as now constituted, was created in August, 1852, and to it the whole subject was turned over. General G. J. Totten, Chief of Engineers, a member of the Board, drew up the plans for a stone tower, and entrusted the execution to Captain (afterwards General) Barton S. Alexander, an eminent member of the Engineer Corps. Under his direction, Major Ogden, by taking advantage of low tides, made a careful survey of the rock, from which survey it was learned that it would not be possible to construct a tower of more than 22 feet in diameter without going outside of the low-water limit; but by going outside of this limit somewhat in five places, a diameter of 30 feet could be obtained. Surveys, consultations, and other preliminaries occupied so much time that work was not begun till the summer of 1855. Alexander thus describes the difficulties of the undertaking:

"It was a more difficult work of construction than either the Eddystone, the Bell Rock, or the Skerryvore, for the Eddystone was founded all above low-water, part of its foundation being up to high-water level. The foundation of Bell Rock was about 3 feet above low-water, while the Skerryvore had its foundation above high-water level; whereas a good part of the Minot's foundation was below low-water. There had to be a combination of favorable circumstances to enable us to *land* on the Minot rock at the beginning of that work; *a perfectly smooth sea, a dead calm, and low spring tides*. This could only happen about six times during any one lunation; three at full moon and three at the change. Frequently one or the other of the necessary conditions would fail, and there were at times months, even in summer, when we could not land there at all. Our working season was from April 1st to September 15th. Work was prosecuted with all possible diligence for more than three years before a single stone could be laid. The difficulty was



to cut the foundation rock into the proper shape and then lay these stones."

Alexander himself first visited the rock on May 1, 1855, and made a re-measurement at dead low-water with the hope of getting a few inches more than the 30 feet for the foundation; but nature did not want any fractions there, and not an inch more could he get. The skeleton of 1851 was still there, grinning at him from under the water, and he must have needed a stout heart to enable him to go on; the heart was there and the head likewise.

A little skirmishing was done, during the month of June, in the way of clearing the rock of sea-weeds and muscles, and in loosening up the old iron stumps. At daylight, on Sunday morning, July 1st, a small party of men landed on the rock and began the work of marking the points of the various levels which were to be cut away, and of getting things ready generally for the next summer's campaign. During the season of 1856 an iron scaffold was erected. It consisted, says Major Heap, of nine wrought-iron shafts inserted into the holes of the old iron light-house, and rising to a height of 20 feet above low-water, the whole bound together at the top by a strong wrought-iron frame; these shafts were 10 inches in diameter at the bottom and 7 inches at the top. It gave great confidence to new hands. By stretching lines between the posts across the rock in various directions, and about 2 or 3 feet above it, every workman had something within easy reach to lay hold of when a wave broke over the rock. Verily, they must have had jolly times at that job.

The work of cutting away the rock and preparing it to receive the masonry was not completed till the summer of 1858; but in the meantime a great deal of work had been done on the neighboring shore. Store-rooms, work-shops, and a stone-yard had been provided, and whenever the weather would not permit landing or working on the Minot, the men were employed in cutting the stone for the tower.

Not to let the sad traditions of Minot's Ledge die out too soon, the bark *New Empire*, loaded with cotton, ran on to the rock in January, 1857, and swept away the iron scaffold, breaking off the iron posts very much as those of the light-house had been broken in the great storm. The scaffold was not replaced, as by this time it was found unnecessary.

A permanent coffer-dam could not be constructed, on account of the violence of the waves under the influence of the prevailing easterly winds, but a species of temporary coffer-dam was very ingeniously contrived. Bags of heavy cotton-duck, which were practically watertight, were partially filled with sand; at low-water two or three hundred of these were built up as a wall against the sea at a place where it was intended to lay a stone in mortar. The water in the miniature bay thus formed was bailed out, and the place kept dry by means of large sponges till the stone was properly laid in its bed of cement. In some cases, however, the stone had to be laid in the water itself; to accomplish this feat, a large piece of thin muslin was laid on a flat surface,

and a layer of cement spread over it; the stone was laid on this bed of cement, the muslin folded up neatly around the stone, and, when the cement had just begun to set (in ten or fifteen minutes), the stone was lowered away to its place. Previous experiments had proved that the cement would ooze through the muslin and make a good bond with the rock below.

When, at last, the foundation was built up above low-water level, the work proceeded more rapidly. An iron mast was set up in the central hole of the former light-house, and rigged up as a derrick, though for some time the machinery and rigging had to be put on and taken off every day that landings were made for laying masonry. The derrick was of simple construction, and was so arranged as to float in the water, so that all that had to be done in "stripping the derrick," after a tide's work was over, was to cast the machinery loose from the mast and throw it, with the attached rigging, overboard; it was then picked by the boats and towed to the tender.

At the end of the season of 1858, about twelve feet of the tower had been completed, after which ordinary tides and winds interfered but little with the progress of the work. On June 29, 1860, just five years after the commencement, the last stone was laid. The building of the lantern, erection of machinery, etc., occupied the remainder of that season, and the light was exhibited for the first time at sunset, November 15, 1860. Despite the many difficulties and dangers of the undertaking, not a life was lost, nor was any one seriously injured during the building of the light-house. This was due to the careful regulations established and enforced for the safety of the workmen, especially during the cutting down of the ledge and the laying of the foundation. Thus:

1. No person was employed who could not swim, or who could not pull an oar and manage a small boat.
2. No landing should be attempted from one boat; two boats, at least, must be always together.
3. While workmen were on the ledge, a small boat, with at least three men in it, should be stationed immediately alongside the rock, on its lee-side, to pick up the men who were occasionally washed from the rock.

The structure is solid, around a narrow central well, up to the sill of the entrance door, a height of 40 feet; at this point the diameter is  $23\frac{1}{2}$  feet. From this to the spring of the cornice, where the external diameter is about 18 feet, the walls gradually decrease in thickness from 4 feet 9 inches to about 2 feet. The hollow cylindrical space thus left is 14 feet in diameter; it is 40 feet high, and is divided into five stories of one room each. Above the cornice is another room, 10 feet in diameter and 7 feet 9 inches high. These six rooms serve as store-rooms, and as apartments for the keepers. The lantern which crowns the whole is 10 feet in height, with a dome of 5 feet, an ornamental finish of 4 feet, and a pinnacle of 7 feet 4 inches, making in all a height of 114 feet 1 inch from the bottom of the lowest stone. The structure is purely conical. Longfellow says that "it rises out of the sea like a

beautiful stone cannon, mouth upward, belching forth only friendly fires." The centre of the lamp-flame is 96 feet above low-water, and consequently, to a person whose eye is 15 feet above the water, it would be visible at a distance of full  $15\frac{1}{2}$  nautical miles.

The weight of the tower is 5881 tons; this alone is enough to insure stability; but since the original 12-inch holes were still there, there was no use in wasting them, and so eight iron posts, 10 inches in diameter and 25 feet long, were firmly cemented both into the rock and the masonry of the tower.

The total cost, including a small supplementary building on shore, was \$200,000. This was the first important work undertaken by the present Light-House Board, and it has had no reason to be ashamed of the result; only, if Congress had been a little more generous (say two or three times more generous), at the outset, way back in the "forties," the present light-house would never have been needed. Still, it is well; for when men have failed to be wise beforehand, it is yet well to know how to be wise behindhand.

We have lingered thus long on the subject of Minot's Ledge Light-House, first, because of its historical associations, taking us back as it does, through nearly half a century, to the days of our childhood and innocence, and restoring with fresh tints many a half-forgotten memory of the dear, old, buried past. Secondly, because both in its old form and in its new it offers us a type of the best form of sea-rock light-houses, and brings clearly to view the immense difficulties of their construction, showing, at the same time, how men of energy and daring succeed in overcoming those difficulties. There are only about a dozen of such light-houses in existence, and but one other in the United States, but if not the most numerous they are certainly the most noteworthy, and stand as examples of perhaps the most remarkable feats of marine engineering that the world has ever seen. What Walter Scott wrote in the *Visitors' Album* of the Bell Rock Light-House, is appropriate to them all,

"Far in the bosom of the deep,  
O'er these wild shelves my watch I keep,  
A ruddy gem of changeful light,  
Bound on the dusky brow of Night;  
The seaman bids my lustre 'hail!'  
And scorns to strike his timorous sail."

It ends pretty flat, but we must not forget that they are *Album* verses.

#### SCREW PILE LIGHT-HOUSES.

Another type of light-house owes its peculiarity to its screw-pile foundation, the invention of which is due to Alexander Mitchell, of England. The lower end of an iron pile, say from six to twelve inches in diameter, is forged to a point; near this end is attached a disk-like screw of a diameter of three feet or more, with a pitch (distance between the threads) of six inches. The groove between the threads is



fully a foot deep all around, and the threads, which are only two or three in number, are quite thin, especially at their edges. This screw is forced down by turning the pile, and when the depth judged necessary, according to the character of the bottom, is reached, it is left in place, and the threads of the screw serve as a foot to support the weight above. The size and number of such screw-piles used in a given construction will vary with the intended size and weight of the superstructure. This is usually a dwelling and store-house of wood, surmounted by a metal lantern. The piles are set in the form of a square, or of a hexagon, or of an octagon, and are, of course, thoroughly braced in all directions.

These screw-pile structures are adapted to sandy bottoms under water, in places where the bottom is not liable to be washed out by currents, and where, at the same time, there is little or no danger to be feared from large masses of floating ice.

As far as we are aware, the most northerly one is at Bridgeport, Conn.; another, nearly in the same latitude, stands on Long Beach Bar, Long Island; the next, on Brandywine Shoal, Del. South of that they dot the coast pretty thickly all the way to Texas. The height of these lights above water varies from 27 feet to 56 feet; they are visible therefore to an eye 15 feet above the water, at a distance of from ten to twelve nautical miles.

A queer accident happened to one of these light-houses. In 1884-85, an hexagonal screw-pile structure was built on the east side of the dredged channel, in Mobile Bay, Ala. It was scarcely finished when it began to sink in the soft mud, and went down bodily seven feet and a half, without canting more than two or three inches from the vertical, and without being strained or distorted in the least. Things began to look blue, for the engineers thought they had struck a quicksand. An injunction, however, was put upon this sinking business by driving twelve enormous wooden piles into the mud and bolting the light-house to them. Since then no further subsidence has been observed.

#### OTHER TYPES.

On Florida's coral strand, there are at least a half dozen magnificent iron skeleton light-houses, the foundation piles for which were *driven into the live coral rock*, a distance of 10 feet or more, through the centre of immense iron disks which rest on the surface of the rock. They are from 110 to 140 feet high, and are equipped as first order lights. Here the screw-pile could not be used, and the coral would not bear the weight of a stone tower of the required height.

Sometimes, in deep water, where neither the screw-pile, nor other skeleton structure could be well or safely located, recourse has been had to "crib" foundations. They are of various kinds in detail, but all consist essentially of a crib of wood or metal, rectangular or circular, sunk to a suitable depth in the sands of a shoal, or resting on the surface of a submerged rock, and protected, if need be, by rip-raps against the scouring action of the water, and filled up with concrete to a proper

height above the sea level. On this, a stone light-house may be built with just as much assurance of safety as if it were founded on the solid rock. A good example of this kind of work is seen in the Fourteen-Foot Bank Light-House, Del. An iron cylinder, 35 feet in diameter, 73 feet long, and made of cast-iron plates  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches thick, was sunk, by means of a caisson, till its upper edge was 24 feet above water, and its foot buried 35 feet in the sand. This was filled nearly to the top with concrete, and on this, a two-story dwelling, and a tower showing a light 59 feet above the sea, were erected. Congress had made an appropriation for this work of \$175,000, but it was completed in all its details, lens, fog-signal and all, for \$123,811.45.

A similar plan has been advocated and tried on the Outer Diamond shoal, off Cape Hatteras, N. C. The water is so rough and so unruly at that place, that neither buoys nor light-ships can live there, and the light on the mainland, about nine miles distant, although a first order light, at an elevation of 191 feet above the sea, is not a sufficient warning against these shoals. A contract was signed about three years ago by Messrs. Anderson and Barr, to plant a light there for the sum of \$485,000. A caisson of steel and iron, weighing 1200 tons, was built, and towed to the spot last spring; but in the attempt to sink it in place, the structure was totally wrecked, and the workmen barely escaped with their lives. The contractors lost nearly \$100,000 in the attempted enterprise. The Light-House Board is again in a brown study over the matter, and it is to be hoped that it will soon evolve some plan that may prove successful.

The last light-houses of which we have to speak are those which are built on dry land, high above all possible contact with the waves. Some are of wood, some of brick or stone; some are iron shells lined with brick; others, in fine, are iron skeletons. The wooden ones are generally modest affairs and need not delay us. Fire Island Light-House, L. I., and Shinnecock Bay Light-House, 35 miles to the east of the former, are examples of imposing structures of brick; the first sheds its light from a height of 168 feet above the water, while the second is only eight feet lower. They are both lights of the first order, and can be seen at a distance of nearly 20 miles.

At Navesink, N. J., there are two brown stone towers, one square, the other octagonal, each 53 feet high, but on account of their position on the highlands, their lights are 248 feet above the sea, so that they are visible for nearly 23 miles.

As a specimen of the "shell-tower," the light-house on Hunting Island, S. C., may be mentioned. Iron panels were cast, each weighing about 1200 pounds, and of the proper shape to form, when assembled, a frustum of a cone. They were about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches thick, and were provided with internal flanges, so that the whole operation of putting them up consisted in swinging the different pieces into position, and securing them with bolts. The lower section was also bolted all around to a heavy concrete foundation. The height from the foundation to the light itself is 121 feet,  $4\frac{3}{8}$  inches; from the sea-level it is 133 feet.

The diameter at the base is 25 feet, at the top 13 feet. The tower is divided into ten stories, the floors of which serve as very efficient bracing, and is plentifully provided with windows throughout its entire height. It was erected in 1875 on a site fully a quarter of a mile from the beach, but on account of the erosion of the land by the sea, it had to be taken down in 1889, and was then moved a mile and a quarter further back. The original cost was \$102,000; the cost of removal just half that amount.

Finally, we have iron skeleton towers of various shapes and often of great heights. Thus, the rear light of the Paris Island Range, S. C., is a triangular pyramid, the base of which measures over forty feet on each side. By means of a windlass and crank the light, which is similar to a locomotive head-light, is run up on guiding-rails on the outside of the structure to a height of 123 feet, but the full height to the apex of the pyramid is 132 feet. The cost, including iron-work, machinery, oil-house, lamp, reflector and everything, was only about \$12,000. South-West-Pass, at the mouth of the Mississippi, is provided with a similar light-house.

Lastly, we come to Hell Gate. To illuminate the narrow, intricate and dangerous channel called Hell Gate, Long Island Sound, N. Y., an iron skeleton frustum of a pyramid was erected by the Light-House Board in 1883-84. Its height, to be very exact, was 255 feet and  $\frac{1}{2}$  of an inch. It was square, and measured 54 feet each way at the base and 6 feet at the top. It carried nine electric lights of 6000 candle power each, and cost about \$11,000, everything included. At night the effect was grand. The tower itself could not be seen, and the light appeared as if suspended from the heavens without any visible means of support. It accomplished all that was intended, and more, for the light was so brilliant that it dazzled the eyes of the pilots, and the shadows thrown were so heavy that they took the appearance of obstacles. The light was therefore discontinued, and the tower sold for old iron in 1886.

"Liberty Enlightening the World" on Bedloe's Island, New York Harbor, holds up a torch of nine electric lights at a height of 305 feet above sea level, which is visible  $24\frac{1}{2}$  miles at sea, or more than 10 miles beyond the outside light-ships. Besides the lights of the torch, there are 5 other arc lights near the base, arranged in such a way as to illuminate the statue itself without being visible at sea, and this number is to be shortly increased.

#### RANGE OF VISIBILITY AT SEA.

If the surface of the sea were flat, as was imagined by the wiseacres of ancient times, a light of sufficient power, placed anywhere above the water, would be visible to an indefinite distance. Even at the very dawn of history men must have noticed that objects retreating on the water appeared to *sink* out of sight and to *rise* again on approaching the observer. It is passing strange, that for hundreds, nay, thousands of years, they failed to see that this phenomenon proved that the surface of the sea was not flat but convex. Anyhow, we know it now; and we



know, too, that the distance at which an object can be seen over the surface of the sea depends on its elevation and on that of the observer's eye above that surface. In the following table, heights are given, feet, and distances of visibility in nautical miles, the nautical mile being about  $\frac{1}{6}$  longer than the statute or common mile :

HEIGHT.	DISTANCE.	HEIGHT.	DISTANCE.
Feet.	Nautical Miles.	Feet.	Nautical Miles.
5	2.555	110	11.986
10	3.614	120	12.519
15	4.426	130	13.030
20	5.111	140	13.522
25	5.714	150	13.997
30	6.260	200	16.162
35	6.761	250	18.070
40	7.228	300	19.795
45	7.666	350	21.381
50	8.081	400	22.857
55	8.476	450	24.244
60	8.852	500	25.555
65	9.214	550	26.802
70	9.562	600	27.994
75	9.897	650	29.137
80	10.222	700	30.237
85	10.536	750	31.298
90	10.842	800	32.325
95	11.139	900	34.286
100	11.428	1000	36.140

EXAMPLE.—Height of Cape Fear Light (N. C.), 100 ft.; visible . . . Miles. 11.428  
 Add for height of look-out's eye, say 50 ft., . . . 8.081  
 Therefore, distance from ship to light, . . . 19.509

But since light-houses have a trick of giving us all sorts of odd heights not found in the table, the hearts of our mathematical friends will take comfort and rejoice in the formula :  $D = \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{H}$ . That is, take the height ( $H$ ) of the object in feet, and extract the square root of that number ; then multiply the root found by  $\frac{2}{3}$  ; the result will be the distance in nautical miles ( $D$ ).

Example. Height of St. Augustine Light, Fla., 161 feet. The square root of 161 is 12.7 nearly ; 12.7 multiplied by  $\frac{2}{3}$  is 14.5 miles,

range for an eye at sea level. The lookout's eye is, say, 60 feet high. From the table, this gives a range of 8.852 miles. Adding 14.5 and 8.852 we get 23.352, say  $23\frac{1}{3}$  nautical miles.

It follows from the table, that to a person out on the ocean whose eye is 20 feet above the water, the sky and sea appear to meet at a distance of about 5 miles all around; if he be *four* times as high (80 feet) his horizon will be *twice* as far (10 miles) away; and if he were *nine* times as high, his range would be *three times* as great. The same rule holds good when looking from the land out to sea. A balloon, at a height of three miles, would have a range, in every direction, of about 144 miles; consequently, if stationed over Wilmington, Del., it would, except where mountains might interfere, take in the whole line from New York City to Washington, all the sea coast from Brooklyn to Ocean City, the upper half of the Chesapeake; Frederick City, Harrisburg, Wilkes-Barre, and even the town of Woodstock, Md. On a clear day, with a good telescope, it would be a sight to be remembered for a lifetime.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S.J.

---

## Book Notices.

---

IRELAND AND SAINT PATRICK. By *William Bullen Morris*, of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. London and New York; Burns & Oates, Limited; Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1891.

We are glad Father Morris has given us in a separate and permanent form the learned and beautiful essays of which this book is composed. The last two are new; the others have already appeared in the pages of the Dublin "Review," and of the "Irish Ecclesiastical Record." Though written, as the author tells us, at long intervals of time, they are distinguished throughout by a remarkable unity of spirit and design and are either intimately connected with or form a natural sequel to the great subject, the critical study of which Fr. Morris began, as he tells us elsewhere, some thirty years ago, and which he has since prosecuted evidently with undiminished interest. Part of the fruits of that prolonged study the public has already enjoyed in the successive editions of the author's "Life of St. Patrick," and those of our readers who are acquainted with that excellent work will be readily assured that they will find the present volume equally interesting and profitable.

The first chapter treats of the relations between St. Martin and St. Patrick; and among the points on which the author has succeeded in throwing a new light we may particularly mention that in which he traces the itinerary of St. Patrick in returning to his own country on his escape from slavery.

We think it is now beyond reasonable doubt that St. Patrick landed at Bordeaux, and passed through Trajectus (Poictons), and St. Patrice, on his way to Mormontier. In the matter of the Saint's longevity and personal relations with St. Martin, we do not think Fr. Morris has been equally successful. He follows the common opinion, and shows indeed that intrinsically it is neither impossible nor improbable, and that it has, besides, the support of numerous early and mediæval authorities. For ourselves, however, we believe there are strong reasons for holding that these ancient authorities misunderstood the meaning of some statements in the original documents which they had before them and reckoned as continuous and successive certain periods of time which, in reality, overlapped each other considerably.

The chapter on Adrian IV. and Henry Plantagenet occupies 83 pages; but we are of the opinion that the reader will find it none too long and will experience a large share of the pleasure which, as we are told, the investigation imparted to the author. The authenticity of the supposed bull of Adrian, authorizing Henry's invasion of Ireland, has been often discussed. We can not, of course, enter at any length into the matter here; a few remarks, however, may not be out of place. At first sight the authorities in favor of the authenticity of the documents are so numerous, and the arguments apparently so strong, that we do not wonder so many have been carried away by them, and some even led to suspect that those who question or reject it are influenced merely or chiefly by a fear that a belief in its genuineness would be injurious to the interests of religion. The suspicion is an unworthy one and could hardly be entertained by any who had learned the facts and weighed



the strength of the arguments on the other side. To those who may feel an interest in this matter, we would recommend especially, besides the present essay, Cardinal Moran's article in the "Irish Ecclesiastical Record," November, 1872, and a dissertation of over 140 folio columns in the French periodical, "*Analecta juris Pontificis*," for 1882. Like Fr. Morris, however, we do not accept the latter writer's theory, that in Adrian's letter to Louis VII., of France, refusing to countenance a proposed joint expedition of Louis and Henry, the country referred to as the object of the expedition was really Ireland, not Spain; the initial of the manuscript having, as the contents, been wrongly understood by the first editors to stand for Hispania instead of Hibernia. But while we believe the French writer to be mistaken on this point, we are sure that no one who compares the two documents, the undoubtedly genuine letter to Louis and the supposed one to Henry, can doubt that one is based on and largely plagiarized from the other.

The two letters begin exactly alike, the first sentence in the one to Henry containing thirty-one words absolutely identical with those in the opening of that to Louis, while the rest are nearly all synonymous. Now, at a time when letters and documents were carefully distinguished and quoted by their opening words, such a thing, we believe, the writer is correct in holding to be without a parallel in the case of genuine documents. Certainly, one may turn over the nearly eighteen hundred letters of Adrian and his successor without finding anything like it. We may remark that Henry must have received a copy of the letter sent to Louis, both having joined in sending the same ambassador, who was, in fact, Henry's immediate subject, Rotrod, the Norman Bishop of Evreux.

As to the numerous writers who have quoted the bull or given it at length in their works it may be truly said that they are not independent authorities; they have merely copied one another and may all be traced back to Giraldus Cambrensis. Dr. Lanigan, and after him Mr. O'Callaghan, Dr. Kelly, and Drs. Pabisch and Byrne in their notes to their translation of Alzog have laid great weight on the fact that it was known to Pope John XXII. and that a codex containing it was found by Bannius in the Vatican library; but this codex Vaticanus Fr. Theiner discovered to be merely a manuscript copy of Matthew Paris. Now Matthew Paris merely continued the chronicle of Roger de Wendover (of which he afterwards made an abridgment) and Roger of Wendover, or rather his predecessor, John de Cella, got his information and took the document in question from Ralph de Siceto, who was probably indebted to Giraldus Cambrensis; though whether true or false, when once published, the document would no doubt be accessible to any English chronicler who wanted to use it. It seems to us, however, a very noteworthy fact that Roger Hooden, one of Henry's chaplains, and the author of *Gesta Regis Henrici II.*, whom he follows, perhaps the Treasurer, Fitz-Neal, and Henry's particular friend, Robert de Monte, though they record Henry's transactions minutely year by year, have not a word about the alleged bull. As to John XXII., he may have got his copy from the manuscript afterwards used by Bassarius, or from his chaplain Philip de Stone, afterwards Bishop of Cork, who dedicated to him an abridgment of some of the works of Cambrensis, or perhaps Donald O'Neill and the Irish princes sent him a copy along with their letter of remonstrance.

Most of those who think the letter a forgery attribute it to Giraldus Cambrensis. Fr. Morris gives some reasons for assigning it to Henry himself. We think it more likely to have been got up by somebody else under Henry's direction and it is at least a curious fact, not hitherto

noticed by any one, so far as we know, that it is to be found actually printed among the letters of Henry's Secretary, Peter of Blois. See Giles' edition, vol. ii., p. 201.

The strongest argument in favor of the authenticity of this celebrated letter is undoubtedly the testimony of John of Salisbury. But it is to be remembered that this testimony is only to be found in the last chapter of one of his works, the "*Metaligicus*," and has no proper connection with the work itself, and that this work had scarcely any circulation; for while there are many manuscript copies of his other works, this appears to be preserved only in a single manuscript, from which the printed editions have been derived.

We may add that even if the letter were really genuine, we do not think it would be such a great matter after all. Suppose the United States had a design of invading Mexico, and our President thought it well to acquaint the Pope of the design, alleging that he was going there for the purpose of putting down violence and disturbance and introducing law and order, assuring him at the same time that the rights of the Church would be carefully protected and the interests of the Catholic religion promoted, and that the Pope should write a letter in reply, praising the President for the good intentions he professed, stating that the Holy See had a special interest in Mexico, as being a Catholic country, and urging that in case it should be determined to carry out the designs contemplated, the promises in regard to religion should be faithfully kept; and, if moreover, the existence of such a letter was not made known to the Mexicans until years after the invasion had taken place, and then only by the invaders themselves, when the alleged writer had been sixteen years in his grave, though both he and his successors had all the time a legate actually residing in the country, what sensible Mexican, even if he chose to believe such a letter genuine would think it of much real importance? Now if there is any real difference between this imaginary letter in regard to Mexico and the alleged letter of Adrian, we confess we have not yet been able to discover it.

We should have liked to say something on the other parts of the book; but we have already exceeded our limits and trust that we have said enough to induce those interested in the subject to read the work themselves.

---

AQUINAS ETHICUS, OR THE MORAL TEACHING OF ST. THOMAS. A Translation of the Principal Portions of the Second Part of the "*Summa Theologica*," with Notes by *Joseph Rickaby, S. J.* 2 vols. Burns & Oates, London.

Fr. Rickaby has greatly added to his already abundant laurels by his latest production, "*Aquinas Ethicus*." Thoroughly equipped as he is not only by the many years of student and professional life which have given him so full a knowledge and so deep a love of his latest subject, but also by a great power of concise and trenchant English, it would not be easy, if indeed possible, to find in the English-speaking world any other man who could make a better translation of scholastic Latin into easy yet technically correct English. The magnitude of the difficulty of translation alone of such a work as the "*Summa*" can to some extent be estimated when we consider that St. Thomas not only gave the Latin a new power, but in great measure made it a new language by incorporating into it the language and terms of Plato, of Aristotle, of the Academy and of St. Augustine. Whole systems are contained in his use of the words, *participatio*, *rationes*, *exemplaria*, *ideae*, *forma substantialis*, *materia signata*, etc. Yet this book, heretofore closed except to a

few, has been made common to the world by Fr. Rickaby; this hidden tongue has been put into beautiful classic English with scarcely a word to which the most fastidious can take exception, and without much, if any, of that circumlocution and paraphrase so often necessary in translating authors whose style is so brief and neat, whose words and sentences are so clean-cut as are those of the Angelical Doctor in all his work, but particularly in his masterpiece, the famous *secunda secundæ*. Take this as a sample chosen at random, of how thoroughly well Fr. Rickaby has done the work he set himself. It is the first article of the thirty-second question and is entitled, "Is alms-giving an act of charity?" In the original it reads: "*Respondeo dicendum quod exteriores actus ad illam virtutem referuntur ad quam pertinet id quod est motivum ad agendum huiusmodi actus; motivum autem ad dandum eleemosynas est ut subveniatur necessitati patienti, unde quidam definiētes eleemosynam dicunt quod eleemosyna est opus quo datur aliquid indigenti, ex compassione, propter Deum. Quod quidem motivum pertinet ad misericordiam ut supra dictum est (q. 30 a 1. ad 2.) Unde manifestum est quod aure eleemosynam est proprie actus misericordia. Et hoc apparet ex ipso nomine nam in graeco eleemosyna a misericordia derivatur sicut in latino misratio, et quia misericordia est effectus caritatis, ut supra ostensum est (q. 30) ex consequenti dare eleemosynam est actus caritatis mediante misericordia.*"

This is the translation: "Exterior acts are referred to that virtue to which their motive belongs; now the motive of alms-giving is to succor one in need. Hence some define almsgiving 'a work whereby something is given to one in need, out of compassion, for the sake of God,' which motive belongs to mercy. And this appears from the name; for in Greek, *eleemosyna* is derived from mercy, and because mercy is an effect of charity it follows that alms-giving is an act of charity, through the medium of mercy."

How neat and true a rendering this is! Could anything be clearer and more concise than the first sentence? It is almost better even than St. Thomas's words. Yet there are better specimens on almost every page, viz., on p. 387, vol. i., where "*huiusmodi necessarii terminus non est in indivisibili constitutus*" is happily rendered "the limit of this necessity is not a hard and fast line;" but the selection given answers the double purpose of being a fair sample of the good work of the translator and also of showing what is perhaps the only defect of this really very able and much needed work. For the question 30, to which St. Thomas refers in explanation and proof of what he says in the quoted article is among the (about) 70 questions and 310 isolated articles which have been omitted, because, as the translator says in his preface, some of them "deal with theology rather than with ethics, some on account of their difficulty, and some for brevity's sake." This article 30 was evidently omitted for the latter reason; yet its omission makes the solution much less clear than the author would have it, and makes St. Thomas appear to do what he never does, dogmatize.

In fact, throughout the "*Summa*" there is such a close connection between all its parts, so complete a dependence of the succeeding questions and articles on the preceding, so perfect a logical sequence, that to omit anything seems to break that splendid chain of reasoning by which we are led through the "*First Part*," with its discussion of God in Himself and as Creator, to His creatures, and particularly to man, his faculties and qualities, to the splendid and perfect "*Second Part*," wherein is discussed the nature of man's happiness, the relations to it of his mind and will, and habits and actions and virtues, theological



and cardinal ; his relations also to the eternal, the natural and human as well as the "Old" and "New" law, and thence to the "Third Part," never finished by the Saint, in which with and by Christ as "the way, the truth, and the life," we are led back through a perfect circle to the God who made us for Himself. And that the omissions thus mar the work by breaking this chain, the article cited is a proof. Because from the text before us it must be divined that mercy is an effect of charity, whereas St. Thomas proved it.

It also seems to us an error of judgment to omit the objections given by St. Thomas at the opening of each article to clear the way and prepare the mind for the correct solution. More even than the "Corpus Articuli," they give us an idea of the extraordinary genius of the author of the "Summa" by showing us how the Angelical Doctor arrived at his conclusions. They thus serve the same purpose as the *status questionis* with which the proof of the proposition is prefaced in our modern treatises and books. Certainly these objections should have been given as a means of meeting modern errors (for error too is old, although its dress be new), and also as a means of presenting in the answers to them, that comprehensive assemblage of principles needed for a thorough knowledge of each question. It probably was necessary to sacrifice something to brevity, but we cannot help feeling that Fr. Rickaby has thrown too great a sop to Cerberus.

Nevertheless, despite these ill-judged omissions, as we cannot help deeming them, Fr. Rickaby's work is, in our opinion, the most valuable addition made in our times to ethical English literature. Modern authors, even the famous among them, will be amazed to find what a treasury the Church has, unknown to them, possessed for centuries in the magnificent "Summa," of St. Thomas Aquinas, which splendid work Fr. Rickaby has made known to the great English-speaking world, the greatest, most splendidly conceived, and most perfectly finished part wherein are discussed the questions which from Plato down to the most modern Hedonist and Utilitarian have interested mankind—human happiness, in what it consists, and how to attain to it. Fr. Rickaby not only makes known to them what is the Christian philosophy of life, the doctrines of Scripture and the Father, put on a scientific basis, but, also, he presents to them from the middle ages the picture of what a good man should be in all times.

---

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE UNITED STATES, FROM THE FIRST ATTEMPTED COLONIZATION TO THE PRESENT TIME. With Portraits, Views, Maps, and Facsimiles. By *John Gilmary Shea*. New York, 1892. Vol. IV. From the Fifth Provincial Council of Baltimore, 1843, to the Second Provincial Council of Baltimore, 1866. New York, 1892.

Dr. John Gilmary Shea, deceased, wrote and published very many valuable works on a great variety of subjects, yet among them all there is no one, we hesitate not to say, that excels in value and importance his "History of the Catholic Church within the Limits of the United States." Each of the three volumes that preceded the volume now before us, received due notice in the REVIEW at the time it was given to the public. It remains for us to notice the fourth and concluding volume.

In this volume the history of the Catholic Church in the United States is narrated during the brief period of twenty-three years, from 1843 to 1866. As compared with the periods comprised in the three preceding volumes, it was a time of peaceful progress, few or no flagrant scandals and disorders arose within the Church in the United States,

and, excepting the "Native American" riots and the anti-Catholic public-school movement, no open or violent assaults were made upon the Church by the opponents of the Catholic religion.

During the preceding period the organization of the Church had been systematized and consolidated, the Ecclesiastical Province of Baltimore, which then comprised all the territory included within the then existing territory of the United States, had been divided, and numerous suffragan sees had been constituted. Five Provincial Councils and a number of Diocesan Synods had been held, the action of which had done much to strengthen the hands of the bishops, and to deepen the convictions of the clergy respecting their obligations to obey their bishops, and of the laity to obey their priests. Measures were adopted to increase the number of the ecclesiastical seminaries, colleges, convents, and schools that had been previously established, and other important movements for the promotion of the interests of religion were instituted.

Thus the way was prepared for greater progress of the Church during the period comprised in the volume before us. It was a period of great activity. During its continuance six additional Ecclesiastical Provinces were constituted, and many additional diocesan sees. The number of priests, churches, ecclesiastical seminaries, colleges, convents, and religious greatly increased, as did also the number of the laity, their piety and generosity in contributing to the support of the Church and its institutions. The foundations of our parochial school system were also laid. The emigration of Catholics from European countries, and especially from Ireland, greatly increased the numerical and material strength of the Church.

These various movements and others which we have left unmentioned, their results and consequences, the personages who prominently took part in them, are lucidly and faithfully described by Dr. Shea in the volume before us. We are entirely within the limits of truth when we say that there is not even a single important event that occurred in any diocese in the United States, nor any one person whose action or labors largely helped to build up the Church or promote its interests in any part of our country, who is left unmentioned in Dr. Shea's narrative.

The volume before us is a fitting close of a long and laborious life unsparingly devoted to the promotion of Catholic literature and the elucidation of the principles and history of the Catholic Church.

THE CONVERSION OF THE TEUTONIC RACE, OR THE FIRST APOSTLES OF EUROPE. With a Preface by the Rev. John Bernard Dalgairns. In two volumes. Vol. I., The Conversion of the Franks and the English. Vol. II., St. Boniface and the Conversion of Germany. By *Mrs. Hope*, Author of "Early Martyrs," etc. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. London: Burns & Oates.

These two volumes form a very valuable contribution to the history of the Church in times and among peoples about whom much has been written, yet much remains to be known and explained. They are not mere compilations, or reproductions of what others have written on the subject. They are the results of careful, discriminating study.

The first volume gives several chapters to the origin of the Germans, their political and social organization, their religion, their earliest intercourse with the Greeks and Romans, their invasions and relations to the Romans during five centuries, the early conversion of the Germans, St. Germanus, Attila, Sts. Loup, G  nevi  ve, Ursula, Leo, relapse of the Germans into paganism or heresy, the Irish Celts the last hope. Three successive chapters are then occupied with the conversion of the Franks.

Seven more chapters are occupied with investigations of the early life of St. Patrick, the condition and history of Ireland in ancient times, the labors of St. Patrick in Ireland, St. Columban, St. Columban's disciples. Part third of this first volume is occupied with an account, in eleven successive chapters, of the conversion of the English in Kent, Northumbria, Wessex, Mercia, Essex, and Sussex, a description of the characteristics of the conversion of England, English kings, queens and princesses, English bishops and abbots, St. Theodore and English schools.

The first chapter of the second volume gives an account of the first English missions to the European continent. In successive chapters the life and labors of St. Boniface are narrated, his first mission to Friesland, his first visit to Rome, his labors in Bavaria, Thuringia, Hesse, his subsequent visits to Rome, the condition of the Church in the countries above named, the Church in Austrasia and Neustria, the development of monastic life, the Carlovingian dynasty, martyrdom of St. Boniface, Charlemagne, learning and education.

---

NUNTIATURBERICHTE GIOVANNI MORONES, vom Deutschen Königshofe 1539, 1540.  
 Bearbeitet von *Prof. Dr. Franz*. Dittrich: Paderborn, Schönan. 1892.

John Morone, Bishop of Modena, was papal nuncio at the court of Vienna, from 1536 till 1542, and his letters to the cardinal secretary of state during that lamentable period—that is, the very flood-tide of the Lutheran reformation—are invaluable to any one who wishes to obtain an insight into the true character of that revolution and the causes which contributed to its success. For eight long years the nuncio struggled hard in the effort to restore the authority of the Holy See in the revolted sections of Germany; and he, first of all and more clearly than his contemporaries, felt and proclaimed that his efforts were wasted in a hopeless cause. Instead of expending time and energy upon the futile task of bringing back the erring sheep, he advises the strengthening of the Catholic party and the pushing forward of needed reforms in discipline. The event fully proved the wisdom of his counsel. When the work of perfecting the Catholic reformation was undertaken in earnest, it was done without regard either to Lutheran theologians or to lukewarm politicians, and it was done well.

The fragmentary manner in which the publishing of original documents like the present, is set about in Europe is much to be regretted. Each new publication is merely a supplement to some preceding one, and in consequence it is extremely difficult to obtain a complete series. For instance, the state papers of Morone, so far as edited, have to be hunted up in three different collections. It were far preferable to issue one complete edition, incorporating, wherever necessary, the results of previous labors. Eventually, no doubt, this will be done, and not until the entire documents are before us in convenient shape, will it be possible to form a correct judgment upon past events. It is consoling to notice that the more information we gain respecting the policy of the Holy See and its agents, the more disposed we are to be proud of it.

---

POETICAL WORKS OF J. C. HEYWOOD, Vol. II. Second Revised Edition. Burns & Oates, London and New York. The Catholic Publication Society.

These two volumes are creditable to the Catholic Publication Society being in every way agreeable to the reader, in as far as paper and printing can make books agreeable. Mr. Heywood is well known as a writer of taste and learning. Three of the poem-plays contained in this edition have been before the public for several years, and have received kindly notice



from many sources. "Herodias," "Antonius," "Salome," are no longer new, and the fact that the author has revised them twice, is an evidence not only of his care but also of the interest his work has excited.

A poet who could not discourse of love would not be a poet, they say. Mr. Heywood is quite a love-poet, and indeed so much of a love-poet that we cannot commend his work to "Reading Circles" unless all the members be of a ripe age. Not that he is a realist, but whether influenced by Solomon or by the pagan classics or by pagan moderns, he devotes too many lines to the purely sensual aspects of "love." His motive is good, his moral is good, but he writes for men of "culture," and not for common folk. To literary men, to students of the poetry of the nineteenth century, Mr. Heywood's work will be interesting.

To the three dramas mentioned he adds here a fourth, entitled "Sforza," which has more elements of an acting play, and less of poetry, than the earlier works. There is room for a Catholic poet,—true poet, who, following the traditions of great Catholic art, uses things sensual measurably, rightly, to impress upon men the mystery, the philosophy, the incomparable beauty of the old law and the new,—of Jehovah and of Christ. In Mr. Heywood we see the possibilities of a great Catholic poet. Let him bury the past; or rather, building on it, lift up the new—the old-new—to the glory of truth in doctrine, in act, in emotion, in passion—to the glory of Christ and of His faith, in all things.

---

DREAMS AND DAYS. Poems. By *George Parsons Lathrop*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1892.

Mr. Lathrop has a poet's soul; a rare love of nature, and a close friendship with her; a love of all things beautiful, a deep experience of life, honest, joyous, serious life; and a gift of happy expression. He sings best to the sound of the lyre, which emphasizes the personal feelings of the artist; and yet his sympathies are too wide, his emotions too lively, to be restrained within the limits of a single instrument. In this tasteful book, he has preserved, for our pleasure and instruction, memoranda of days and nights passed in the company of one Muse or another.

There was a time when the poet could look forward to a laurel crown, which, amid the plaudits of the admiring crowd, the greatest in the land should place upon his head. Now-a-days he must generally be satisfied with the poor, if willing praise of the reviewer. We must change all this. The poet deserves something more than wordy encouragement. Men and women should read his books, commit to memory his good poems, good stanzas, good lines; spread his name and his fame. In encouraging writers like Mr. Lathrop, Catholics should be especially forward. Healthy minds make healthy minds, and without health there can be no beauty. Our place it is to do all in our power to establish a school of thought, healthful, sound; and a school of art as perfect as art can be. Mr. Lathrop has not sung his last or his best song. Let us urge him on. He can, he will do more in the field of thought, and in the field of language,—beautiful thought and beautiful language.

---

THE LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS DI GERONIMO, S. J. By *A. M. Clarke*. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1891.

This great Jesuit missionary (born 1642, died 1716) was filled, in the early years of his priestly career, with an intense desire of going into foreign parts to evangelize the heathen; but Providence had destined him for the no less necessary, and hardly less arduous, task of evangel-

izing his own countrymen of southern Italy. The renown of his great labors has not been dimmed by the two centuries which have well nigh elapsed since he changed the face of Naples and its surrounding territory. His biography has been repeatedly narrated in Italian, German and French; and that he is so little known to the English-speaking public indicates how defective our Catholic literature still remains. His foreign-looking name may have been a bar to his popularity. The old form of "St. Francis Jerome" could scarcely be permitted to stand, unless on St. Augustine's principle that "it is better grammarians should censure than that the people should fail to understand." Italians have always known him as *Francesco di Girolamo*, but the present author insists upon *Geronimo*. If the Saint is to be presented to priests and people for well-merited veneration, we must fix upon a name for him, and since *Geronimo* is as convenient as any other, let it remain, *with the G pronounced like J, and with the accent upon the antipenultimate.*

---

THEOLOGIA MORALIS PER MODUM CONFERENTIARUM. P. Benjamin Elbel, O. S. F. Novis curis edidit P. F. Irenæus Bierbaum, O. S. F. Pars IX. De Sacramento Pœnitentiæ. Pars X. De Sacramento Matrimonii, De Censuris atque De Irregularitatibus. Paderbonæ, 1892. Ed. Typographia Bonifaciana. Benziger Bros. New York.

These two parts conclude the third and last volume of this new edition of Father Elbel's Moral Theology. We have already noticed the work at very considerable length. Elbel died June 4, 1756. This edition is a republication of the fifth, revised and corrected by the author himself in 1751, but now brought down and corrected according to the latest decrees of the Holy See. There is no author quoted more frequently by S. Alphonsus than Elbel: and that his authority has not grown less is clear from Lehmkuhl, who says that "he deserves to be remembered amongst the classical and chief writers of moral theology."

With Lacroix and Elbel of the old authors, and Lehmkuhl, Sabetti and Ballerini of our own day, the priest's library will contain all that he needs on this branch of sacred science. The work is excellently printed, fine large type and good paper.

---

LECTURES ON SLAVERY AND SERFDOM IN EUROPE. By W. R. Brownlow, M.A., Canon of Plymouth. New York. Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates, 1892.

Persons who wish to know how great a debt the world owes to Christianity with regard to the abolition of Slavery can learn it from this book. After an introductory chapter containing, among other interesting and important matters, the letter of our Holy Father, Leo XIII., to the Bishops of Brazil, on the subject of slavery, Canon Brownlow describes slavery in the Roman Empire, its horrors and demoralizing effects and the manner in which the Church first mitigated its severity and finally abolished it. He then contrasts Roman slavery with mediæval serfdom. In succeeding chapters he describes slavery and serfdom in England, in the British Colonies and Islands; serfdom in France, Germany, Hungary and Russia, and the manner in which it was abolished in each of these countries.

---

THE POSITION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ENGLAND AND WALES DURING THE LAST TWO CENTURIES, Retrospect and Forecast. Edited by the XV. Club. With a Preface by Lord Braye, President of the Club. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates, 1892.

This work received a prize of fifty guineas offered by the Fifteen Club for the best treatise on the Position of the Catholic Church in England

and Wales during the last Two Centuries, with special reference to the alleged progress of the Faith at the present time. Its purpose is to show the "mistake of thinking that England would rapidly return to the Faith," and until this delusion is destroyed there is little hope of real progress.

There is room, wide room, for differing with the writer's inferences and conclusions, but the book itself is very valuable, because of the many details it gives respecting the condition of the Catholic Church in different parts of England, and its statistical tables.

THE SACRAMENTALS OF THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH. By *Rev. A. A. Lambing, LL.D.* New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

This is a book especially intended for the instruction of lay members of the Church, and well has the intention been accomplished. The author first explains the nature of the sacramentals, the manner in which they produce their supernatural effects, and the difference between them and the seven Sacraments. In separate chapters, he describes and explains the Treasures of the Missal, of the Ritual, of the Breviary, Sign of the Cross, Way of the Cross, Holy Oils, The Asperges, Forty Hours' Adoration, Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, the Rosary, Brown Scapular, the Angelus, Agnus Dei, etc.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA TO THE ACCESSION OF HENRY VIII. By *Mary H. Allies.* New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. London: Burns & Oates.

We sincerely regret that regard for limits of space prevent us from giving a longer notice of this truly valuable work. It is not so much a history as it is a lucid exhibit and exposition of the interior meaning of historical facts and events connected with the history of the Church in England from the first dawn of Christianity to the accession of Henry VIII. To persons desirous of obtaining a clear and correct understanding of the causes and reasons of the vicissitudes and conflicts which the Church in England had to encounter during the period mentioned, this work is invaluable.

THE RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH TO SOCIETY. Theological Essays by *Edmund J. O'Reilly, S.J.* (Sometime Professor of Theology in Maynooth College, at St. Beuno's in North Wales, and in the Catholic University of Ireland). Edited, with a biographical notice by Matthew Russel, S.J. London: John Hodges, 1892.

This is a collection of very able essays on revelation and the natural law, the nature of the Catholic Church, its pastoral office, its legislation, its executive power—the clergy, education, church property, the definition of Papal infallibility, obedience due to the Pope, liberty of conscience, marriage laws as affecting Protestants, the Church and politics, the Pope's temporal power, etc.

THE SPIRIT OF ST. IGNATIUS. Translated from the French of Father Xavier De Franciosi, S. J. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros., Printers to the Holy Apostolic See. 1892.

We take pleasure in recommending this book to English-speaking Catholics. It has been aptly called the "Spirit of St. Ignatius," for in every page, in every line of it, the Saint is living and breathing; and as no one could come in contact with the Saint without being benefited spiritually, so do we feel it must be with all who will read this book.



THE HAIL MARY, or Popular Instructions and Considerations on the Angelical Salvation. By *J. P. Val D'Eremao, D.D.* Author of "The Serpent of Eden," "The Keys of Peter," "Practical Guide to Meditation," etc, New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates.

The title-page of this book as given above, sufficiently describes its contents. The "instructions" are lucid and interesting and the "considerations" are highly edifying. It would be well if the book were in the home of every English-speaking family.

---

LETTERS OF ARCHBISHOP ULLATHORNE. London: Burns & Oates. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

The notice prepared for this valuable book is crowded out by other and possibly less important matter, and will appear in our next number.

---

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

[Some of the books mentioned under this head were received too late for careful examination; notices were prepared of a number of others, but were omitted owing to want of space to insert them. The mention of their titles here does not preclude further notice of them in a subsequent number of the REVIEW.]

THE STATE, ELEMENTS OF HISTORICAL AND PRACTICAL POLITICS. A Sketch of Institutional History and Administration. By *Woodrow Wilson, Ph.D., LL.D.*, Author of "Congressional Government," Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1892.

LIFE OF THE BLESSED ANGELINA OF MARSCIANO, Virgin. Compiled from Ancient Documents by the *Honorable Mrs. A. Montgomery*. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates.

THE SPIRIT OF THE SACRED HEART. A Manual of Prayers. Compiled from many approved sources. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates.

FIFTY-TWO SHORT INSTRUCTIONS ON THE PRINCIPAL TRUTHS OF OUR HOLY RELIGION. From the French, by *Rev. Thomas F. Ward*. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1892.

THEOLOGIA PASTORALIS COMPLECTENS PRACTICAM INSTITUTIONEM CONFESSARIÆ. Auctore *Jos. Aertnys, C. SS. R.* Tornaci, 1892. Received from Burns & Oates.

THE FREE-TRADE STRUGGLE IN ENGLAND. By *M. M. Trumbull*. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co. 1892.

THE CONFESSOR AFTER GOD'S OWN HEART: From the French of the Third Edition of *Rev. Father L. J. M. Cros, S. J.* Browne & Nolan, Dublin. 1892.

FLORINE, PRINCESS OF BURGUNDY. A Tale of the First Crusade. By *Wm. Bernard McCabe*. Boston: Thomas B. Noonan & Co. 1892.

We have received the following works from the publishing houses named below:

From Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago:

A MARTYR OF OUR OWN TIMES. Life of Rev. Just de Bretenières, Missionary Apostolic, Martyred in Corea in 1866. From the French of *Rt. Rev. Mgr. D'Hulst*. Edited by Very Rev J. R. Slattery, Rector of St. Joseph's Seminary, Baltimore.

HELP FOR THE POOR SOULS IN PURGATORY. Prayers and Devotions in Aid of the Suffering Souls. By *Joseph Ackerman*. Edited by Rev. F. B. Luebbemann, Editor of the "Poor Soul's Advocate."

AN EXPLANATION OF THE BALTIMORE CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. For the Use of Sunday-School Teachers and Advanced Classes. By *Rev. Thomas L. Kinkead*.

CONTINUITY OR COLLAPSE? The Question of Church Defence. By *Canon McCave, D.D.* and the *Rev. J. D. Breen, O.S.B.*; edited by the Rev. J. B. McKinlay, O.S.B. New Edition.

LIFE OF BLESSED PETER ALOYSIUS MARY CHANEL, MARIST, First Martyr of Oceania and Apostle of Fortuna. From the French. Edited by Basil Tozer.

THE JOURNEY OF THE MAGI KINGS. From "The Life of the Blessed Virgin," after the Meditations of *Sister Anne Catherine Emmerich*.

ON CHRISTIAN ART. By *Edith Healy*, with an Introduction by *Right Rev. J. L. Spalding, D.D.*, Bishop of Peoria.

TALES AND LEGENDS OF THE MIDDLE AGES. From the Spanish of *F. de P. Capella*. Edited by Henry Wilson.

THE TRIAL OF MARGARET BRERETON. By *Pleydell North*, Author of "M. le Cure," "Russian Violets," etc.

ST. THERESA'S OWN WORDS; or, INSTRUCTIONS ON THE PRAYER OF RECOLLECTION, SIMPLICITY IN PRAYER. By the Author of "Les Petites Fleurs." From the French.

GERTRUDE'S EXPERIENCE. By *Mrs. Mary C. Monroe*. From the French.

THE BRIC-A-BRAC DEALER. Translated from the French.

From Catholic Publication Society Co., New York; and Burns & Oates, London:

THE INTERIOR OF JESUS AND MARY. Translated from the French of the *Rev J. Grou*, of the Society of Jesus. Edited, with a Biographical Sketch and Preface, by *Rev. S. H. Frisbee, S.J.* In two volumes.

THE CHURCH; OR THE SOCIETY OF DIVINE PRAISE; A Manual for the Use of the Oblates of St. Benedict. From the French of *Dom Prosper Guéranger*, Abbot of Solesmes.

MY ZOUAVE. By *Mrs. Bartle Teeling*, Author of "Roman Violets," etc.

From Art and Book Company, London; and Benziger Brothers, New York:

THE LADY OF THE RAVEN'S COMBE. By *E. H. Dering*, Author of "Memoirs of Georgianna, Lady Chatterton," "In the Light of the XXth Century," etc., etc. ;

GERTRUDE MANNERING; A Tale of Self-Sacrifice. By *Frances Noble*, Author of "Madeline's Destiny."

THE HEIR OF LASCARRAGH. By *Victor O'D. Power*, Author of "Bonnie Dunraven," etc.

From M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin:

MEDITATIONS ON THE PRINCIPAL TRUTHS OF RELIGION AND ON THE HIDDEN AND PUBLIC LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. By *The Most Rev. Dr. Kirby*, Archbishop of Ephesus. Rector of the Irish College at Rome.

THE BIRTH-DAY BOOK OF THE MADONNA. Compiled by *Vincent O'Brien*, Editor of "The Birth-Day Book of the Sacred Heart."

From John Murphy & Co., Baltimore:

THE BLESSED VIRGIN IN THE CATACOMBS. By *Rev. Thomas J. Strahan, D.D.*, Professor of Church History in the Catholic University of America.

ADA'S TRUST. By *Ana Hanson Dorsey*, Author of "Cocaina," "Flemmings," etc.

THE STOLEN CHILD. By *Henrick Conscience*.

From Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati:

THE HOLY MASS EXPLAINED. A Short Explanation of the Meaning of the Ceremonies of the Mass. Useful to All who take Part in the Sacred Mysteries. By *Rev. F. X. Schouppe, S.J.* Translated by the *Rev. P. O'Hare, S.J.*

From Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago; and Browne & Nolan, Dublin:

THE CEREMONIES OF SOME ECCLESIASTICAL FUNCTIONS. By *Rev. Daniel O'Loon*, Dean Maynooth College.

From McCauley & Kilner, Baltimore:

CHRIST OUR TEACHER. Translated from the French by *Father J. B. St. Jure, S. B.* With an Introduction by His Eminence *James Cardinal Gibbons*.

From Pollard & Moss, New York, and Burns & Oates, London:

FREVILLE CHASE. By *E. H. Dering*, Author of "Sherborne," "Memoirs of Georgiana, Lady Chatterton," etc.















PERIODICAL

70750

**DOES NOT CIRCULATE**

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE  
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM



